This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Educ T 108.73.325

Harvard College Library

FROM

THE LIBRARY OF

PROFESSOR E. W. GURNEY,

(Class of 1852).

Received 22 May, 1890.

3 2044 097 033 849

MANUAL

OF

UNITED STATES HISTORY.

FROM 1492 TO 1850.

BY SAMUEL ELIOT,

AUTHOR OF A HISTORY OF LIBERTY, AND PROFESSOR OF HISTORY AND LITERATURE IN TRINITY COLLEGE.

BOSTON:
BREWER AND TILESTON.
1873.

EducT 708.73.325
~~5347.18.2~~ ~~EducT~~ ~~708.56.5~~

22 May, 1890.
From the Library of
PROF. E. W. GURNEY

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1856, by

SAMUEL ELIOT,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

ELECTROTYPED AT THE
BOSTON STEREOTYPE FOUNDRY.

PREFACE.

I HAVE written this book to supply a want felt by others, as well as by myself. We have looked in vain for a work, of moderate extent, in which the leading principles and the leading facts of our history are set forth side by side. To provide such a volume for the reader and the student is the object of the following Manual.

In writing it, I have endeavored to observe the proper proportions. The same space is not given to every period or to every transaction. On the contrary, events are narrated at greater or less length according to their importance — a few days occupying as many pages in some parts of the volume as a long series of years in others. By thus making inferior matters subordinate, I trust that I have done more justice than might be anticipated from the appearance of the book to the great passages in our history. It is nowhere, however, a book of details. I have confined myself intentionally to outlines — endeavoring to sketch these in such a way as to suggest com-

prehensive conceptions of the whole, rather than complete views of any single part.

In the last division of the work, I have entered upon dangerous ground. Party feelings are still active in relation to many of the movements and many of the men described in my later chapters. It is vain to hope that the views which I have taken will be every where acceptable. But I can conscientiously say that I have written of the latest, as of the earliest occurrences, without a sensation of partisanship, or of devotion to any cause less universal than the cause of truth.

The character of the publication not admitting frequent notes or large citations, it is right for me to state that, while I have principally relied upon original authorities, I have also followed later writers to a considerable degree. To some works — Irving's Columbus, O'Callaghan's and Brodhead's Histories of New York under the Dutch, Sparks's Appendixes to the Writings of Washington, Lossing's Field Book of the Revolution, Duyckinck's Cyclopædia of American Literature, and Hildreth's History of the United States — I am under obligations which duty and inclination alike compel me to acknowledge.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

OCCUPATION.

CHAPTER I.

EUROPE BEFORE 1492.

Europe — Activity there — Material movement, 3. Intellectual movement — Moral movement, 4. General elevation — Monarchy in Europe — Discovery of America, 5.

CHAPTER II.

COLUMBUS.

Early life — Project of discovery, 7. His motives, 8. Voyage of discovery — The west the possession of Spain, 9. Other voyages of Columbus, 10. His spirit — Name of America — A new world, 11.

CHAPTER III.

SPANISH SETTLEMENTS.

Spanish adventures — Ponce de Leon in Florida — Various expeditions, 13. Luis de Cancello — Melendez, 14. De Espejio and Vizcaino — Motives, 15. Institutions — Circumstances — Extent of Spanish claims, 16.

CHAPTER IV.

FRENCH SETTLEMENTS.

New France — Carolina: Fate of its Huguenots, 17. Expedition to avenge them — Acadie and Maine: De Monts and De Saussaye, 18.

Canada: Champlain — Collisions with the English, 19. Priests and missionaries — Other settlers — Institutions — Circumstances, 20. Extent of French claims, 21.

CHAPTER V.

English Settlements.

Section 1. — Early movements — England and Columbus — Voyages of the Cabots, 22. Interval: Gilbert and Drake, 23. Raleigh — Failures of his colonies, 24. Gosnold and others — Ill success of the English, 25. *Section* 2. — Companies — Organized efforts, 25. Patent of Virginia, 26. London Company: Members and colonists — Jamestown — New charters, 27. Fortunes of the colony — Institutions, 28. An infant colony — Fall of the company, 29. Virginia a royal province — Growth of the colony, 30. Plymouth Company: Members — Colonization attempted, 31. Various proprietors and companies — Settlement of Plymouth, 32. Its distinction in history, 33. Political forms — Spirit, 34. Grants — Attempt at general government — Chaos, 35. New Hampshire and New Somersetshire — Cape Ann and Salem, 36. Company of Massachusetts Bay — Boston, 37. Increase and independence — Charter government, 38. Puritan principles — External relations — Internal relations, 39. Connecticut, 40. Providence and Rhode Island — Dissolution of the council, 41. End of companies — Position of New England — Thomas Morton, 42. *Section* 3. — Proprietors — Grant of Maryland, 43. A proprietary government — Religious liberty — Troubles, 44. Other proprietors — Conclusion — English motives, 45. Institutions — Circumstances — English names, 46.

CHAPTER VI.

Dutch Settlements.

Group of traders — Spirit in Holland — Dwindled in America — Hudson's voyage, 47. Company of New Netherland, 48. Proposals of the Plymouth Puritans — West India Company — Walloon colony, 49. New Amsterdam — Patroons, 50. English claims, 51. Trade of the colony, 52.

CHAPTER VII.

Swedish Settlements.

Idea of Gustavus Adolphus — Oxenstiern calls in Germany — Results, 54. Opposing claims, 55.

CHAPTER VIII.

Indian Races.

European races — Indian races — Names and numbers, 56. Algonquins — Iroquois, 57. Mobilians — Customs and institutions, 58. Influence upon the European — Counter influence upon the Indian, 59. African race — The country, 60.

CHAPTER IX.

Europe from 1492 to 1638.

The great change — Its cause and character — Luther's course, 61. Divisions — A crisis of good and evil, 62. Religious consequences — Political consequences — Spain, 63. France — Holland, 64. Sweden and Germany — England, 65. Intellectual expansion, 66.

PART II.

ENGLISH DOMINION.

CHAPTER I.

England and France from 1638 to 1763.

Question of precedence — Reign of Louis XIV. — The monarchy, 69. The church — The nation, 70. Reaction — The English nation — Periods of trial — Revolution of 1688, 71. Aristocracy in power — English progress, 72. England and France, 73.

CHAPTER II.

The Thirteen Colonies.

Old and new colonies — Plymouth annexed — Maine annexed, 74. New Hampshire — Massachusetts, 75. Connecticut — Rhode Island — Four colonies in New England, 76. Virginia — Maryland, 77. Carolina, North and South, 78. New York, 79. New Jersey, 80. Pennsylvania, 81. Delaware — Georgia, 82. Aspect of the thirteen, 84.

CHAPTER III.

Colonial Relations.

Races — Classes, 85. Of the old world, 86. Institutions belong to the freemen — English law, 87. Colonial governments, 88. Towns, 89. Assemblies, 90. Churches — Persecution in Massachusetts: Child, 91. Baptists, 92. Saltonstall's remonstrance — Dunster of Harvard College, 93. Quakers, 94. Witches, 95. Persecution elsewhere, 96. Save in Rhode Island, 97. Inter-colonial difficulties — Shawomet and Massachusetts, 98. United Colonies of New England, 99. Treatment of Rhode Island — Disagreements, 100. Dissensions elsewhere — Penn and Baltimore, 101. Relations to the mother country — The crown — Charles II. and Massachusetts, 102. Loss of the Massachusetts and other charters — Parliament, 104. Navigation acts — Duties, 105. Royal governors — Berkeley in Virginia — Bacon's rebellion, 106. Andros in New England, 107. Revolution — But not liberty, 108. Fletcher in New York, 109. General strictness, 110. Perils of the frontier, 111.

CHAPTER IV.

Indian Wars.

Spirit of the Indians — Spirit of the English, 112. Missionary labors — The Mayhews and Eliot, 113. Supports — Results, 114. Wars in Virginia and Maryland, 115. Pequot war — Narragansets, 116. King Philip, 117. War throughout New England — Destruction of the Narragansets, 118. Of Philip — Peace, 119. Abenakis in arms — Peace in the centre and south — War in North Carolina, 120. In South Carolina — With Cherokees — With western tribes, 121. Pontiac's war — Indians in Pennsylvania, 122. Other wars, but the issue decided — Later missions, 123.

CHAPTER V.

Dutch Wars.

Wars with Indians, 125. Effect upon New Netherland — Internal restrictions, 126. Religious persecution — Subjection of New Sweden, 127. New Amstel — English aggressions, 128. War: Loss of the province — Recovery and final loss, 130.

CHAPTER VI.

Spanish Wars.

Spanish race — Its colony — Collisions with the English, 131. Effect on the colony — War: Attacks on St. Augustine and Charleston, 132.

Treaty of Utrecht — Second war: Descents on Florida — Third war: Georgia and Florida, 133. Fourth war: Cession of Florida, 134. Spain in Louisiana and California — Character of the Spanish wars, 135.

CHAPTER VII.

French Possessions.

French race — New France — System of government, 136. Relations with Indians and English, 137. Acadie, including Maine — Canada, including New York, Wisconsin, Michigan, 138. The Mississippi: Illinois — Louisiana, 139. French dominion — Colony in Texas, 140. Colony in Mississippi — Colony in Alabama — Grant to Crozat, 141. Western settlements: Indiana — Loss of Acadie — Forts: Pennsylvania and Ohio, 142. Mississippi Company: New Orleans — Missouri: the thirteen of France — Vastness and weakness, 143.

CHAPTER VIII.

French Wars.

Wars with Indians in the north — In the south — Strife between the French and the English, 144. Indecisive wars — King William's war, 145. Its character and course, 146. Religious differences — Queen Anne's war, 147. Collision in the west, 148. And in the east — King George's war, 149. Blood shed in Nova Scotia, 150. The Ohio Company — Blood shed in Pennsylvania: George Washington — The final struggle, 151. Extent, 152. Losses of the English — Their subsequent victories, 153. Conclusion of the war — The French retire, 154. French and English compared, 155.

CHAPTER IX.

Colonial Development.

Development of territory — Of occupation, 156. Of habits of life — Of education, 157. Colleges — Of the press, 158. Official interference, 159. Editions of the Bible — Intellectual development: In action, 160. In literature — In science, 161. In art, 162. Influences from abroad — Liberality in religion, 163. Church of England, 164. Project of bishops, 165. Classes: The slaves, 166. Colonies: Union, 167. Contributions to Boston, 168.

CHAPTER X.

The Mother Country.

Views of the mother country — Board of trade, 169. African Company, 170. Colonial governors, 171. Cornbury in New York — Burnet and Belcher in Massachusetts, 172. Clinton's appeal, 173. Parliamentary interference — Commercial rule, 174. Military rule — Impressment at Boston — A commander-in-chief of the colonies, 175. Judicial tenure — Writs of assistance, 176. English dominion, 177. Effects on the colonies — Upon the mother country, 178. Temporary unity, 179.

PART III.

THE INFANT NATION.

CHAPTER I.

Provocations.

Old troubles extended — Parties in the mother country, 183. Views of the colonies — Parties in the colonies, 184. The two sides — Ministries of the period — Point of taxation, 185. Discussion — Sugar act, 186. Stamp act — Resistance, 187. Congress — Declaration of rights and liberties, 188. Effect, 190. Riots — Non-importation and non-consumption, 191. Repeal of stamp act, 192. American rejoicings — New acts — Resistance again, 193. Massachusetts convention, 194. Act concerning trials in England, 195. Colonial divisions — Boston massacre, 196. Other disturbances, 197. Additional act concerning trials — Tea destroyed in Boston, 198. And elsewhere — Slave trade, 199. Chastisement of Massachusetts and Boston, 200. Quebec act — Conventions and Provincial Congress in Massachusetts, 201. National spirit — Continental Congress, 202. Its work — American Association, 203. Petition and addresses — Peace or war, 204. Preparation, 205.

CHAPTER II.

War.

Arming of Massachusetts — Not unprovoked or unanticipated, 206. Arming of other colonies — Course of Parliament, 207. First collision, 208. Its significance — Lexington and Concord, 209. Effect: Meck-

Lenburg declaration, 210. War in Massachusetts — Ticonderoga and Crown Point — Proceedings in Congress, 211. Washington appointed commander-in-chief, 212. Bunker Hill — Washington at the head of the army, 213. Difficulties — Siege of Boston, 214. General government, 215. The thirteen complete — Military operations, 216. Loyalists — Great Britain determined, 217. Washington before Boston — Recovery of the town — The victory, 218. Increasing perils, 219.

CHAPTER III.

Declaration of Independence.

Transformation of colonies to states — Idea of independence, 220. North Carolina and Virginia — Congress — Hesitation, 221. Lee's resolution — Debate, 222. Committee on declaration — Resolution adopted, 223. And the declaration — The United States, 224. Plan of confederation — Unity in Congress — State constitutions, 225. Divisions amongst the people, 226.

CHAPTER IV.

War, continued. Second Period.

Three periods — Characteristics of the second period — Reception of the declaration, 227. Defence of Charleston — Loss of New York, 228. Loss of Lake Champlain and the lower Hudson — Loss of Newport, 229. Defence of New Jersey, 230. Organization of army, 231. Dictatorship — Paper money, 232. Arrival of Lafayette, 233. Defeat of Burgoyne, 234. Loss of the Hudson Highlands — Loss of Philadelphia, 235. Washington's embarrassments — Loss of the Delaware, 236. Wickes's cruise — Cabal against Washington, 237. Army quarrels, 238. Army sufferings — Aspect of Congress, 239. Treaty with France — British conciliation, 240. Recovery of Philadelphia, 241. Possession of Illinois — End of the period, 242.

CHAPTER V.

War, continued. Third Period.

Characteristics — Failure to recover Newport, 243. British and Indian ravages, 244. Decline of American affairs, 245. Loss of Georgia — Defence of Charleston, 246. Failure to recover Savannah — Invasion of Virginia — Operations in the north, 247. Jones's cruise, 248. Spain in the war, 249. Loss of South Carolina — Failure to recover it, 250. Abandonment of the south — Its defence — Darkness in the north, 251. Light in

the south, 253. Holland in the war — Final adoption of the Confederation, 254. Its inefficiency, 255. Defence of the Carolinas, 256. The central states in danger, 257. Crisis — American preparations, 258. Defeat of Cornwallis, 259. Effect — Prospects, 260. Evacuation of the south — The European combatants, 261. Cessation of hostilities — Release of prisoners, 262. Treaties of peace, 263. Evacuation of the north — Troubles in the American army, 264. Disbanding — Government of the nation, 265. Washington's counsels, 266. And prayers, 267.

CHAPTER VI.

The Constitution.

Foreign sympathy — Lafayette's visit, 268. Wants of America — Organization, 269. The states: Internal troubles, 270. Dismemberments — Case of Vermont, 271. Disputes between state and state — General government, 273. Organization of the north-west territory, 274. Difficulties with Spain, 275. And Great Britain, 276. Dark times — Old foundations — Recent superstructures, 277. Religious privileges, 278. Ecclesiastical organizations — Suggestions of a national Constitution, 279. Conventions at Alexandria and Annapolis — Action of Virginia, 280. Of other states and of Congress, 281. Opening of the Convention — Aspect, 282. Plans of a constitution, 283. Question of powers, 284. A national system adopted — Parties: Small states and large states — Views of state government, 285. Votes of states, 286. Agitation, 287. Parties: North and south — Apportionment of representation — The slave trade, 288. Details and discussions, 289. Adoption of the Constitution — Opposition in the nation, 290. Constitutional writings, 291. Adoption by the states, 292. Character of the transaction, 293. Sympathy for mankind — Literature of the revolution and the Constitution, 294. The music of Billings, 295.

CHAPTER VII.

Washington's Administration.

Washington president, 296. Organization of government — Solemnity of the work, 297. Washington to his fellow-Christians — The nation, 298. Work of Congress: The departments and the judiciary — Amendments to the Constitution, 299. Revenue — Credit, 300. Manner of decision, 301. National bank — Parties, 302. Especially north and south — Points concerning slavery, 303. As to the territories, 304. Starting point of future strife, 305. Presidential tours — Work of the states — New states — Dependence upon Washington, 306. Animosity of parties — Insurrection in Pennsylvania, 308. Indian wars, 309. Indian interests, 310. Heckewelder, the missionary — Tribute to Algiers,

311. Foreign relations — Commercial treaties, 312. Treaty with Spain — Relations with Great Britain and France, 313. Parties thereupon, 314. Washington proclaims neutrality — Point proposed — Mission of Genet, 315. Great Britain and France invade American neutrality — Threatened war with Great Britain, 317. Mission of Jay, 318. His treaty, 319. Opposition — Ratification — Continued opposition, 320. The point gained, 321. Continued embarrassments: From abroad, 322. And at home, 323. Abuse of Washington, 324. His retirement — Lafayette, 325.

PART IV.

THE GROWING NATION.

CHAPTER I.

Foreign Aggressions.

Party administrations, 329. Parties amongst the people — Parties in relation to foreign aggressions, 330. Missions to France — Arming of the United States, 331. War — Strain upon the nation, 332. Nullification, 333. Another mission to France, 334. Death of Washington, 335. The French mission — Difficulties with Spain, 336. Mississippi Territory: Slavery under debate — Territory of Indiana: Slavery again, 337. War with Tripoli — Acquisition of Louisiana, 338. Troubles abroad and at home — Chief point involved in the acquisition, 339. Organization of Louisiana territories, 340. Other territorial and state organizations — Burr's projects, 341. Difficulties with Great Britain — Mission, 342. Affair of the Chesapeake, 343. Aspect of Great Britain and France, 344. British and French aggressions, 345. The administration against war — Embargo, 346. Succeeding acts, 347. Opposition, 348. Indian hostilities, 349. Louisiana and Florida — Warlike preparations against Great Britain, 350. Termination of preceding strifes, 351.

CHAPTER II.

War with Great Britain.

Declaration — Cause of the United States, 353. A party cause, 354. As such opposed, 355. War at home, 356. Means for the war, 357. Position of Great Britain — Of France — The war: Losses on north-

western frontier, 358. Perry's victory on Lake Erie, 359. Operations on New York frontier, 360. Actions on Niagara frontier, 362. Defence of Lake Champlain — British superiority — Successes at sea, 363. Subsequent reverses, 364. Losses upon the coast — Loss of north-eastern coast — Capture of Washington and Alexandria, 365. Defence of Baltimore — Indian foes, 366. National straits, 367. Party controversies, 368. Hartford Convention — Charges of disunion, 369. Proceedings of the Convention, 370. Results — Nullification in Connecticut and Massachusetts, 371. Defence of Louisiana, 372. Martial law at New Orleans, 373. Reappearance of the navy, 374. Peace preliminaries — Treaty of Ghent, 375. Protection of foreigners, 376. Indian treaty — Algerine treaty, 377. Exhaustion of the nation, 378.

CHAPTER III.

Missouri Compromise.

Foreign affairs — Domestic affairs, 379. Administrations — Seminole war, 380. Acquisition of Florida, 381. New states — Proposal of Missouri — Question of slavery, 382. Constitutional argument, 383. Two sides — Intense agitation, 384. Maine seeks admission — The compromise, 385. Different interpretations, 386. Admission of Missouri — Slave trade, 387. Visit of Lafayette, 388.

CHAPTER IV.

The Monroe Doctrine.

Relations with Central and South America — Monroe doctrine, 389. Purpose, 390. Congress of Panama — An American league, 391.

CHAPTER V.

Tariff Compromise.

Administrations — Question before the country — Georgia controversy, 392. Tariffs, 393. Nullification at the south — Removals from office, 395. Concessions to Georgia, 396. Tariff questions — Foot's resolution: Debate, 397. Revision of tariff, 398. Nullification in South Carolina — Secession, 399. Resolution of South Carolina, 400. Resolution of government, 401. Resolution of states — Tariff compromise, 402. Decision, 403. On the great question, 404.

CHAPTER VI.

Financial Disorders.

National finance — Veto of United States Bank charter, 405. Removal of deposits, 406. Agitation, 407. Money troubles — Surplus revenue — Abolitionism, 408. Indian wars, 409. Disturbed foreign relations — Especially with France, 410. Parties, 411. Commercial crisis, 412. Independent treasury, 413. Insolvency of states, 414. Repudiation in Mississippi, 415. National credit, 416.

CHAPTER VII.

Annexation of Texas.

Recognition of Texas — Settlement of that state, 417. Revolution — Project of annexation, 418. Texas refused admission, 419. Relations with Great Britain, 420. Treaty of Washington, 421. Landmark in our history — Sedition in Rhode Island: Approach, 422. Outbreak, 423. Civil war, 424. New states and territories — Movements concerning Texas, 425. Question of slavery — A compromise, 426. Consequences, 427.

CHAPTER VIII.

War with Mexico.

Causes of War: Mexican — American, 428. Boundary of Texas, 429. Mission from United States — Hostilities, 430. Disparity of combatants — Oregon controversy, 431. Settlement, 432. Conquest of northeast of Mexico, 433. Conquest of Chihuahua, 434. Conquest of New Mexico — Conquest of California, 435. Operations in Gulf of Mexico — March upon city of Mexico, 437. Battles on the way — In valley of Mexico, 438. Last actions, 439. Composition of United States forces — Forced supplies, 440. Peace: First steps — Next steps, 441. Treaty, 442. Character of the war, 443.

CHAPTER IX.

Compromise of 1850.

New territory, 444. Difficulties — Old questions subsiding, 445. Organization of old territory — Organization of new territory — Slavery question, 446. Convention of southern members of Congress, 447. The territories declare against slavery, 448. Clay suggests compromise — Webster in debate, 449. Report of compromise, 450. Its adoption — Continued controversy, 451.

CHAPTER X.

National Development.

Development of Territory — Of population, 452. Of occupation, 453. Of investments — Of communications, 454. Of education, 455. National institutions — Exploring Expedition, 456. The press — Libraries, 457. Literature: Political — Theological, 458. Legal — Historical, 459. Scientific — Belles lettres — Fiction, 460. The drama — Poetry, 461. Art — Religious development, 462. Charities, 463. Conclusion: The past and the present, 464. Part of the nation in human history, 465.

APPENDIX.

European Sovereigns, ... 467
American Authorities, ... 468
Presidents of Continental Congress, ... 468
National Administrations, ... 468

PART I.

OCCUPATION.

1492–1638.

CHAPTER I.

EUROPE BEFORE 1492.

Europe.

THE history of the United States begins in Europe. There the movements, there the men arose, appointed to prepare the way for a new nation on the earth.

Activity there.

If we look over the century, or the half century, preceding 1492 in Europe, we are struck by the numerous signs of change and of growth. Many countries, it is true, appear to be unmoved; perhaps the few alone seem to be really sharing in the activity of the period. But the activity is all the more remarkable in being confined to a portion only of the European races. It both seems and is a strange thing that three or four nations, not closely united with one another or amongst themselves, should all at once put forth their energies, and lift the world, as it were, into a wider and a loftier sphere.

Material movement.

The great material movement of the age was in maritime discovery. An instinct to search over unknown seas for unknown shores led to many an adventure and many an acquisition. No people was more distinguished in these enterprises than the Portuguese, whose navigators made their way to the Madeiras (1418–20) and the Azores (1432–57) on the west, then on the south, along the African coast, to and beyond the Cape of Good Hope, (1486–97.) The chief prize at which the adventurers were aiming lay in the East, amongst the lands

embraced under the common name of the Indies. But a golden hue of wealth and of fame was spread over all the seas and all the shores within the reach of the Europeans.

Intellectual movement.

There was also a great intellectual movement. The invention of printing, (1440–50), followed by the revival of ancient learning, awakened the scholar from a long-enduring trance. He found more to learn, more to teach, and above all, a larger circle by whom his studies would be encouraged and his teachings received. The poet and the artist imbibed fresh inspiration from the increasing culture of the times; whatever was the vocation of the mind, it was at once enlarged and ennobled. If this were the proper place to cite examples, we should turn to Italy, whose scholarship, whose poetry, and whose art never shone out together with greater lustre than during the fifteenth century. The glow spread to other nations in their turn.

Moral movement.

The great moral movement of the period was the most wonderful of all. For ages, the spirit of man seemed to have ceased to act, except in the narrow and darksome limits prescribed by authority. Here and there an individual had appeared to plead for the freedom and the faith of the Christian, but never with permanent success, often with immediate failure. At the later time of which we speak, there was a spiritual restlessness, too general and too strong to be repressed. Men tore the bandages from their eyes; they shook the shackles from their arms; and though long submission had rendered them incapable of effective exertion, they did not exert themselves in vain. At the end of the century, a reformer appeared in Italy, close to the centre of Christendom at Rome, in the person of the friar Savonarola, (1452–98,) whose rebukes of corruption and of oppression were forerunners of the greater reformation that was to come.

General elevation.

If there is any single impression to be derived from movements so various, it is that of the elevation of classes hitherto feeble and degraded. The voyagers, the students, and above all, the earnest believers of the period, sprang, in many cases, from what were called the lower orders; and back upon the same orders, in all cases, descended more or less of the benefits resulting from the deeds that were achieved. But we are not to suppose that human nature was changed, or that the improvement in men, in their character or their condition, was instantaneous. The work now going on had been begun, so far as its higher elements were concerned, ages and ages before. It would require ages and ages to come before it could be in any degree completed.

Monarchy in Europe.

Another movement of the times was more limited in its relations and its effects. This was the rising of the modern monarchies from out the strife, direct and indirect, in which they had long been engaged with the Papal authority. The monarchical power, at first nothing more than the substitution of one oppressive dominion in the place of another, or in the place of another combined with itself, of course affected its possessors rather than its subjects. But as the preparatory process by which more liberal constitutions might be ultimately reared, the independence of the European monarchies was the great political revolution of the period. Prominent amongst the individual figures of sovereigns were Louis the Eleventh of France, (1461–83,) Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, (1479–1506,) and Henry the Seventh of England, (1485–1509.)

Discovery of America.

Amid these changing systems, these varying efforts, the middle ages passed away, and the modern ages began. If there is any occurrence to stand as the first upon the newly-opened rolls, it is that

which came in season at once to profit by the time and to quicken its advance. Had the event taken place before, or long before, it would have been lost in the silence and the stagnation that had prevailed; had it not taken place when it did, or soon after, many of the desires to which men were freshly stirred, many of the resources with which they were freshly provided might have failed for want of object and of development. The event of so much significance was the discovery of America in 1492.

CHAPTER II.

COLUMBUS.

Early life.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS * was born in Genoa, about the year 1435. Following the sea from the age of fourteen, he was attracted, some twenty years afterwards, to Lisbon, then the centre of maritime enterprise. There Columbus married the daughter of an Italian navigator in the service of Portugal; there he renewed the studies and the experiences of earlier manhood; there, after a residence in one of the Madeira Islands, far out in the Atlantic, he made known his project of crossing the entire ocean. He was then close upon the age of forty, (1474.)

Project of discovery.

Both reflection and tradition suggested the possibility of reaching the farther East across the western seas. A report among the northern nations told of voyages from Iceland to Greenland, and thence to Vinland, the Land of the Vine, where settlements had been made, but abandoned. Still more familiar were the travellers' tales of Marco Polo, the Venetian, (1295,)† and of Sir John Mandeville, the Englishman, (1364,)† who painted in glowing colors the provinces and the islands, the cities and the palaces of the Grand Khan of Tartary upon the eastern shores of Asia. It was to seek these realms, with the

* In Italian, *Colombo;* in Spanish, *Colon.*

† Dates of their return.

magnificence of which all Europe had long been ringing, that Columbus proposed to sail westward. But, however supported by rumor or by argument, his plans met with no encouragement. Their rejection by the Portuguese court (1484) threw him back upon his native Genoa, then upon other states, and finally upon Spain. Eighteen years in all of rebuff and of hostility had been endured, when Isabella of Castile yielded to the earnestness and lofty visions of the Italian, already an elderly man, (April 17, 1492.)

His motives.

The mere fact of his age prevents our ascribing selfish or covetous motives to Columbus. Doubtless he had his schemes of achieving fame and fortune, as well for himself as for the sovereigns by whom he was sustained. The compact with Ferdinand and Isabella provided that Columbus should bear and bequeath to his heirs the titles of Admiral and Viceroy of all the lands discovered by him, together with the right to one tenth of the revenues expected from the same. But there were higher ends to which he more ardently aspired. The journal of his voyage begins with reminding Ferdinand and Isabella, to whom it is addressed, of their determination to send him to "the lands of India," and to "a prince who is called the Grand Khan," "to see the said prince and the people and lands, and discover the nature and disposition of them, and the means to be taken for the conversion of them to our holy faith." * He elsewhere repeats an assurance that he had made in presence of the sovereigns: "Whatever I gain from this enterprise of mine shall be expended in the conquest of Jerusalem." The conversion of the unbelievers, succeeded by the rescue of the holy sepulchre from the hands of those still unconverted, fill in the background of the design which Columbus had conceived, the foreground

* Mr. Irving's translation in his Life of Columbus, Book III. Chap. I.

alone being occupied by the land to which he was pointing the way.

Voyage of discovery.

In this spirit Columbus set sail from Palos, with three small vessels and with one hundred and twenty companions, at dawn on Friday, August 3, 1492. Ten weeks afterwards, at dawn on Friday, October 12, he reached the shores of an island, of which, as soon as he could disembark in solemn state, he took possession with prayers and thanksgivings, under the name of San Salvador, or Holy Saviour. For nearly three months he cruised amongst the Bahamas and the larger islands to the south-west, one of which, Cuba, he supposed to be the continent of Asia, while another, Hispaniola, was taken to be an island of great beauty and wealth described by Oriental voyagers as lying off the Asiatic coast. Leaving a garrison on the latter island, and taking a few natives in his train, Columbus retraced his course, arriving off the Tagus on the 4th, and at Palos on the 15th of March, 1493. He had found, as he thought, nothing more than he had proposed, and the name of *West Indies* was therefore given to his discoveries.

The West the possession of Spain.

Although thus regarded as a part of the earth already visited by Europeans, the West Indies were more than sufficient to satisfy the discoverer and his sovereigns. So favorable were his accounts of the route across the sea, and of the treasures to which it led, in the form of precious metals, jewels, and spices, as well as of beautiful and boundless lands, that all Spain was stirred with wonder and exultation. The first thought with the rulers was to make sure of their acquisitions, the more so as Portugal was known to have an eye upon discoveries in the same direction. Accordingly the Spanish sovereigns had recourse to the Pope of Rome, who had previously confirmed the claim of the Portuguese to the countries on

and beyond the African coast. A Papal bull was issued, declaring Portugal possessed only of what might be discovered on the east of a line "from the north to the south pole, a hundred leagues to the west of the Azores," while all to the west of the line was secured to the Spaniards. In the following year (1494) the Portuguese acquiesced in a division according to a line drawn, not one hundred, but three hundred and seventy, leagues to the west of the Azores, or Cape Verd Islands. Yet this did not prevent them from pushing their discoveries northward and southward within the limits of the Spaniards. Still less did the award of Rome affect the enterprise of other nations, as will be seen hereafter.

Other voyages of Columbus.

The Spaniards, however, were long the most active in exploring and in occupying their Indies. Not to speak of many other expeditions, in which all sorts of men took part, three more were conducted by Columbus himself. On his second voyage (1493–96) he founded the first town, and engaged in the first war in which Europeans were concerned on the western shores. The town, named Isabella, was in Hispaniola; the war was waged with the natives of the same island. It was at the end of this voyage that the first slaves from America were taken to Europe. His third voyage (1498–1500) brought Columbus to the continent, which he supposed himself to have reached on the shore of Cuba, but which he did not see until near the Island of Trinidad, off the northern coast of South America, (1498.)* He soon became involved in the first serious dissensions amongst the Europeans in the Indies, and was sent home from Hispaniola in chains. It was not long after that the first negro slaves from Spain † were transported to

* The Cabots reached the continent in 1497. See Chapter V

† The first from Africa did not go before 1511.

the Spanish colonies, (1502,) but not by Columbus. He, liberated by the sovereigns, made his fourth and last voyage, (1502–4,) during which he attempted the first colony upon the continent near the River Belen, on the Isthmus of Panama. He had met with far more numerous failures than successes, when he returned to Spain after an almost uninterrupted service of thirteen years. Others, following in his steps, had met with greater rewards than he; but the dreams of the voyagers and of their countrymen were still to be fulfilled.

His spirit. Infirm and injured as he was and as he had been, Columbus never lost heart. Even when just set free from his fetters, at the end of his third voyage, he had written to the Spanish sovereigns and to the Roman pontiff of his unshaken determination to extend the Christian faith and to recover the sepulchre at Jerusalem. The same objects were commended in his will to his posterity. Indeed, it seems as if he clung to his religious purposes the more earnestly as his worldly projects failed. A few months passed after his final return, and the aged discoverer sank to rest, seventy years old, (May 20, 1506.)

Name of America. His spirit, so free from irresolution and from worldly pride, has descended in part, it is to be hoped, upon the lands to which he led the way. But they bear another name. Amerigo Vespucci, a native of Florence, but a resident in Spain at the time of Columbus's discovery, subsequently sailed to the west in the service of Spain, and then of Portugal. His descriptions of the continent which he reached, and which he portrayed as possessing all the attributes of a newly-discovered one, induced a German geographer to coin the name of America about the time that Columbus died, (1507.)

A new world. Vespucci was far from conceiving or conveying the truth concerning America. Voyages in the

north, to which we shall revert, had already (1497–98) begun to reveal the real character of the new shores. But it was some years before Cuba was found to be merely an island, (1508,) and it was still longer before the Pacific was reached across the isthmus in the centre, (1513,) and through the straits on the south of the continent, (1520.) Slowly and wonderingly it was learned that Columbus had discovered a new world.

CHAPTER III.

Spanish Settlements.

Spanish adventures.

From almost every point hitherto gained in America, as well as from the shores of Spain, adventures, some great, some small, some national, some individual, were urged by the Spaniards in all directions. The West Indies, at first the whole, soon became the mere centre of the Spanish possessions.

Ponce de Leon in Florida.

The first to reach the territory of the present United States was Ponce de Leon, a companion of Columbus. Long visited by dreams of riches, and latterly, in his advancing age, excited by rumors of a fountain in which youth might be renewed, Ponce set sail from Porto Rico in search of the treasures in the north. On Easter Sunday, — in the Spanish calendar *Pascua Florida*, — he descried a land to which, in his mingled visions of resurrection and of abundance, he gave the name of *Florida* or Flower-land, (1512.) Nine years later, with a commission from the Spanish crown, as governor of Florida, Ponce returned to conquer and to colonize his discovery. But driven off by the natives of the coast, the old adventurer left Florida to return no more, (1521.)

Various expeditions.

A series of expeditions had already begun to scour the Atlantic coast. The Portuguese Cortereal had led the way, twenty years before, in a cruise towards the north, (1501.) A line of Spanish adventurers, intent upon treasure and conquest, succeeded.

Vasquez de Ayllon twice made descents upon Chicora, the later Carolina, (1520–24.) Gomez sailed farther to the north in quest of a western passage to richer lands, (1525.) Pamphilo de Narvaez tried his fortune in Florida, (1528,) whither also De Soto directed his greater expedition, and pursued his wanderings northward and westward (1539–43) with no greater reward than the discovery of the Mississippi, (1541.) At the same time, Vasquez Coronado was penetrating from Mexico high up into the interior, (1540–42,) while De Cabrillo (1542) was coasting the Pacific shore, and, though dying on the voyage, leaving his pilot, Ferrelo, to ascend as far as Oregon, (1543.) Of these western explorations there were few if any results to satisfy the explorers. Nor were the adventurers in the east better contented; the only ones to gain any thing being those who laded their ships with slaves. The natives had been pressed into bondage almost from the moment when they were first seen in the West Indies.

Luis de Cancello.

A figure of more Christian aspect appears in Luis de Cancello, a Dominican friar. Obtaining an order from Spain that all the slaves from the northern shore of the Gulf of Mexico should be returned, he set sail with such as he could collect. Instead of proposing to conquer the natives, he went with the hope of converting them to a religion of peace. But in his first interview with them on the coast, he and two priests accompanying him were slain, (1549.)

Melendez.

Nearly twenty years elapsed, and our soil was still unoccupied by the Spaniards. At length a veteran commander, Melendez de Avilez, engaged to complete the conquest and to commence the colonization of Florida, with a train of soldiers, priests, and negro slaves. He was of a stern temper, without a vision of romance or a touch of sensibility to turn him from the severe enterprise

which he had assumed. He began with the foundation of St. Augustine, (September 8, 1565,) the oldest town in the United States. Then he routed and slew some French settlers who had lately encamped upon the ground claimed by Spain,* and whose destruction had been one of the great incentives to his expedition. Where they fell most thickly, the conqueror marked out the site of a Christian church. The colony thus resolutely founded brought none of the rich returns that had been looked for; but it was not abandoned.

De Espejio and Vizcaino.

Fifteen years afterwards, the expeditions from Mexico were renewed by Ruiz (1580) and De Espejio, (1581,) the latter of whom, followed by soldiers and Indians, marched northward, until he named the country New Mexico, and founded the settlement of Santa Fe, the second town of the United States in point of age. Twenty years later, (1602,) a squadron under Sebastiano Vizcaino explored the Californian shore, bestowing upon its headlands and its bays many of the names which they still bear. It was Vizcaino's hope to colonize the coast, but he died in the midst of his schemes, (1608.)

Motives.

The motives of the Spanish settler, as we perceive, were partly of a high and partly of a low nature. Devoted to great aims and to generous deeds, he encountered, as Luis de Cancello did in Florida, the perils of an unknown shore, in order to impart to others the faith in which he lived and for which he was willing to die. But in another aspect the Spanish character grows dark and threatening. Men, like the greater part of those who have been mentioned, sought our land for gold or for dominion; sometimes, indeed, with a national object, but more generally for merely selfish ends. Motives of this sort led to scenes of cruelty and of carnage, on which it is, fortunately, unnecessary to dwell.

* See the next chapter.

Institutions.

The institutions of Spain were those of an absolute monarchy. They lent but little aid to the development of the better elements in the national character. Indeed, they rather encouraged the opposite elements, both before and after the colonies of the nation were founded. A military rule was the only political institution of Florida. It was in the hands of a few officials, whose authority was kept up at the sacrifice of the general progress of the settlements. A rigid system of trade, upholding a monopoly in favor of the government, or of the capitalists dependent on the government at home, increased the obstacles with which the colony had to contend.

Circumstances.

Coming with these motives and under these institutions, the Spaniards found themselves in circumstances of similar tendency. Choosing the south for their first, and, as it proved, their only settlements, from its promising the richest harvest, they met the influences springing from the air above them and from the earth beneath them. The habits of indulgence and of repose which ensued were any thing but favorable to character or to prosperity.

Extent of Spanish claims.

Few and far between were the Spanish settlements. But the Spanish claims were universal. In the first place, there was the papal bull of 1493, conveying a right to all America. In the next place, there were the successive discoverers from Ponce de Leon to Vizcaino, whose labors had won the continent anew. The name of Florida was stretched from the Gulf of Mexico to the Gulf of St. Lawrence; that of New Mexico was made equally extensive in the interior and on the west. Could names, and deeds, and papal bulls have sufficed to support the Spanish claim, it would have prevailed throughout the United States.

CHAPTER IV.

French Settlements.

New France.

The approaches of France to our country were made, first by fishermen, (1504,) and then by navigators. A Florentine, Verrazzani, in the French service, sailing along the coast from Florida to Newfoundland, was not deterred by any previous discoveries from giving to the continent the name of *New France*, (1524.) Ten years after, the Frenchman Cartier renewed the name in voyages in and about the Gulf of St. Lawrence, (1534–42.)

Carolina. Fate of its Huguenots.

Nothing, however, was done in a persevering way to fix the name upon the territory, until Admiral De Coligny conceived the idea of a colony to which his brother Protestants, the Huguenots, might repair for refuge against persecution in France. After failing to make a settlement in South America, De Coligny despatched a party to the northern coast, where a fort, named Carolina in honor of the French king, Charles, was erected near Port Royal in the present South Carolina, (1562.) This settlement likewise falling through, another was made upon the St. John's in Florida, where a second Fort Carolina was reared, (1564.) The mutinous dispositions of the colonists had already begun to threaten the existence of the settlement, when it was annihilated by the Spanish force under Melendez de Avilez, (1565.) Such of the French as did not escape or fall in battle were put

to death by the Spaniard and the Catholic, "not as Frenchmen," he is said to have declared, "but as Lutherans." Such was the unhappy fate of the first fugitives from the old world to the new. Objects at once of religious and of national animosity, they were pursued by enemies enlisted against them as on a crusade. The passions of Europe obtained fresh space in America; the feeble fell, the strong triumphed as they had done in older lands.

Expedition to avenge them.

But there was something inspiring, after all, in the associations of the western shore. If the fugitives thither were murdered by their foes, they were not forgotten by their friends. Three years after their victory, the Spaniards were surprised on the same ground by a French expedition under De Gourgues, a soldier of Gascony, who had sold his estate in order to avenge his fallen countrymen. He took the Spanish forts, and hung his prisoners, with the inscription above them, "Not as Spaniards or Mariners, but as Traitors, Robbers, and Assassins." Thus was our soil a second time darkened with the slaughter of strangers. Without waiting an attack from the Spaniards at St. Augustine, De Gourgues sailed home, the last of the French to attempt the possession of Florida or of Carolina, (1568.)

Acadie and Maine. De Monts and De Saussaye.

A long period elapsed before the French reappeared, except as fishermen or as traders, in any part of America. At length, a grant of all the territory from Pennsylvania to New Brunswick, under the name of Acadie, was made by Henry IV. of France to the Sieur de Monts, (1603,) one of whose officers, Poutrincourt, made the first permanent settlement of Frenchmen in America at Port Royal, (1604,) since Annapolis. A plan of De Monts to make a settlement upon Cape Cod, though twice attempted, was given up on account of the hostility of the natives, (1605–06.) Some

years afterwards, one or two Jesuit missionaries crossed over from that part of Acadie which was occupied, to a part as yet unoccupied, within the limits of the present Maine, (1612.) They were followed the next year, by De Saussaye, the agent of Madame de Guercheville to whom the earlier grant to De Monts was now reconveyed; the limits being extended so far as to reach from Florida to the St. Lawrence. De Saussaye, accompanied by a few Jesuits, began the colony of St. Sauveur upon Mount Desert Island, off the coast of Maine, (1613.) It was hardly begun, however, before it was broken up by an attack from an English armed vessel belonging to the then rising colony of Virginia.

Canada. Champlain.

Meantime the banners of France had been carried up the St. Lawrence. Champlain, the greatest leader whom the French had as yet followed to the west, laid the foundations of Quebec in the heart of the province of Canada, (1608.) The next year, forming an alliance with the Algonquins, then at war with the Iroquois or Five Nations of New York, he marched southward to the lake which bears his name, (1609.) Six years later, he took the lead in another foray which penetrated the forests on the southern shore of Lake Ontario, (1615.) A new way appeared to be open to French settlements in the United States.

Collisions with the English.

But nothing followed. The English arms, after an interval of several years, were carried against the northern settlements of the French. Acadie, already made the subject of an English grant, and Canada were conquered, but restored, (1628–32.) Then the French came down in their turn, and drove the English from the trading posts established by the Plymouth colony on the Maine coast, (1631–35.) The attempts to repel them were in vain; on the contrary, they forbade the English to

pass Pemaquid, a point midway between the Kennebec and the Penobscot. The interior was at the same time in the occupation of the French priests, if of any Europeans.

Priests and missionaries.

The priests and the missionaries of France were the most prominent amongst her settlers. They came full of adventure as of faith, hesitating at no danger, shrinking from no sacrifice. That there should be some less worthy amongst the number was a matter of course. It was equally natural that, among the most worthy, there should be many to magnify their work, to count their converts too freely, and to oppose their antagonists too fiercely. But taken all in all, the French missionaries have hardly received the place that they deserve in our history. What they were and what they did will appear more clearly at a later period.

Other settlers.

With the priest came the soldier, the explorer, and the trader, all animated by the love of enterprise, to say nothing of its rewards in fame or in riches. They form a less sinister group than the Spanish settlers, more supple, more gay, though by no means more gallant or more adventurous.

Institutions.

Much of the difference may be ascribed to the influence of the French institutions. These, at the time in question, were the institutions of a comparatively limited monarchy. If there were arbitrary influences in the government, sufficient, as we shall hereafter observe, to oppress its subjects and its colonies, there was also something of a more generous nature, by which the devotedness of the missionary, the bravery of the soldier, and the zeal of the adventurer were sustained.

Circumstances.

The circumstances in which the French settlers were placed tended to confirm all their enterprise and all their fortitude. Abandoning the southern Carolina and drawing in the limits of Acadie on the south, they were

for a long time concentrated upon northern shores and in northern valleys. In these lands, adventure was not to be pursued, nor was sustenance to be obtained, without energy and hardihood.

Extent of French claims.

In following the French into Acadie and Canada, we have gone far beyond the limits of the United States. But their Acadie embraced our Maine, or a large portion of it; their Canada comprehended our Vermont and our New York, or large portions of them; not to speak of the western regions afterwards included in the same province. We shall return to the French at the epoch of their later acquisitions. For the present, we leave the name of New France, bestowed by Verrazzani and Cartier in their voyages, and confirmed by Poutrincourt, Champlain, and De Saussaye, in their settlements, extending in immense proportions along the seaboard and in the interior. It was a title to be set against the Florida and the New Mexico of Spain.

CHAPTER V.

English Settlements.

Section I. — *Early Movements.* 1492 *to* 1606.

England and Columbus.

The English were first connected with America through Columbus. When his plans of discovery were declined by the Portuguese court, he sent his brother Bartholomew to make the same offers to Henry VII. of England, (1484.) Bartholomew, long upon his way and upon his return, was bringing back some favorable proposals from the English king just as Christopher was returning from his first voyage, (1493.) It was too late for England to obtain the services of Columbus.

Voyages of the Cabots.

But it was just in time for England to profit by his discoveries. Both the king and his subjects, at least those of his subjects who were interested in navigation, seem to have caught the impulse naturally springing from such an enterprise as had been achieved. Within three years from the first return of Columbus, Henry authorized a Venetian then belonging to Bristol, John Cabot, with his three sons, to start an expedition at their own expense, in order to do whatever they could for themselves, and at the same time to set up the banners of the English monarch, as his vassals and deputies, upon the lands supposed to exist northward of those discovered by Columbus, (1496.) The Cabots, setting sail in the following year, (1497,) reached a shore called by them *Prima*

Vista, the First View, since known by the name of Labrador. It was more than a year before the continent was gained by Columbus. Another voyage, made a year later (1498) by Sebastian Cabot, the second son of John, and a native of England, was directed along the coast of the new continent from the latitude of Labrador to that of the Chesapeake.

Interval. Gilbert and Drake.

So successful a beginning augured great ends. But there ensued a long interval, in which none but isolated and remote adventures towards the west were undertaken in England. The fisheries of the north were for many years the only objects of attraction in the direction of America. Then the opening of hostilities, at first rather of a private or piratical than of a national character, against Spain,* drew the English towards the southern regions. But the central territories, those of the present United States, were long unvisited except for some passing purpose. More than three quarters of a century had elapsed since the coasting voyage of Sebastian Cabot, and both the Spaniards and the French had several times seized upon the shores discovered by the English navigators, when a new permission to possess and settle the western lands was given by Queen Elizabeth to one of her noblest subjects, Sir Humphrey Gilbert, (1578.) At the same period, while Sir Francis Drake, the half hero, half freebooter of the English navy, was on his voyage of adventure and plunder round the world, he gave the name of New Albion to the coasts of California and Oregon. Thus gaining a foothold on the western as well as on the eastern side of the continent, England was recalled, at a moment of general activity throughout the nation, to her interests in America.

* Beginning about 1570, though there was no formal war until 1585.

Raleigh. Sir Humphrey Gilbert perished in the course of a second attempt to reach his American possessions, (1583.) But his claims were immediately transferred to his half brother, Walter Raleigh, the courtier and the cavalier of the age in England, (1584.) A voyage of exploration was immediately made under his directions to the coast of our North Carolina, of which so flattering an account was returned to him and to his sovereign, that the name of Virginia, from the virgin Queen Elizabeth, was not thought too great for the new land.

Failures of his colonies. In the following year, (1585,) Sir Richard Grenville, one of the chief commanders of the time, left a colony of one hundred and eighty persons at Roanoke Island; but such were the hardships which they encountered, that they were only too well satisfied to be taken home by Sir Francis Drake a year afterwards. They had scarcely gone when Grenville returned with supplies for them, and he, unwilling to have the colony abandoned, left fifteen of his mariners to keep possession until they could be reënforced, (1586.) The little band was gone, murdered, it was believed, by the natives, when, in the next year, (1587,) a fresh party of one hundred and seventeen arrived. Soon after they came, the first English child to see the light in America was born. She was the daughter of Ananias Dare, and the granddaughter of John White, the leader of the expedition, who gave her the name of Virginia. But the presence of the infant brought no better fate to the colony than had befallen its predecessors. The one hundred and eighteen disappeared, and though sought for at various times, were never heard of more. Raleigh lost heart as well as means. He made over his patent to a number of persons, (1589,) who, with less enterprise than he, met with still less success. North

Carolina was but a waste as far as English settlements were concerned, and Virginia but a name.

Gosnold and others.

Many years passed before any further attempts were made to occupy the American coast. The cessation of hostilities with Spain * at length reopened the way to commercial and colonial enterprise. Bartholomew Gosnold, after landing on Cape Cod, sailed thence to Buzzard's Bay, where, on Elizabeth's Island, named after his queen, he commenced, but soon abandoned, a settlement, (1602.) The adjoining coasts were revisited the next year (1603) by Martin Pring, and again, the next year but one, (1605,) by George Weymouth, both, like Gosnold, commanders of distinction. The preparation for settlements was decidedly resumed.

Ill success of the English.

It was high time. The Spaniards had their St. Augustine and their Santa Fe, the French their Port Royal, though this was beyond the limits of our United States. But the English, the first to discover the coast, were still without a single foothold upon it. Wherever they had gained one, it had slipped from beneath them.

Section II. — *Companies.* 1606 *to* 1635.

Organized efforts.

Hitherto the efforts of the English in exploring and in settling the American shore had been those of individuals. No one, indeed, unless it were those who went on voyages for fishery or for trade, attempted his enterprise without the formal countenance of the sovereign. But there had been no organized efforts such as were now prepared.

* 1604. But it was some time since the war had been generally carried on.

Patent of Virginia.

A year or two after James I. succeeded to the English throne, he issued the patent of Virginia. This was a twofold grant of the American territory from what is now North Carolina to what is now Maine. Of this vast tract, the southerly half* was appropriated to the First Colony, and the northerly † to the Second Colony, each colony to be founded and governed by a separate council, to which the grant was made. The council or company, as it is generally styled, of the First Colony went by the name of London, from the residence of its prominent members. For a similar reason, the name of Plymouth was given to the council or company of the Second Colony. The great point, however, is this, that the parties to the patent were not colonists, but capitalists, not adventurers, but speculators, who, in their respective corporations in England, not in America, were declared possessors of the best portion of the American territory. At the same time, the companies were invested with ample powers to settle "colonists and servants," to impose duties, and to coin money. Their obligations, in return, were to pay over to the crown a share of their profits,‡ and to support the laws and the church of England. To exercise some sort of supervision over so great corporations as these, a council for Virginia was instituted by the king, who, to complete his work, put forth a code of laws and regulations for the direction of the various bodies which he had created.

* From lat. 34° to lat. 38°, with a right, if first in the field, to make settlements as far north as 41°.

† From lat. 41° to lat. 45°, with a right, if first in the field, to make settlements as far south as 38°.

‡ One fifth of the gold and silver, and one fifteenth of the copper, that might be found.

THE LONDON COMPANY.

Members and colonists.

The moving spirit of the London Company appears to have been Richard Hakluyt, prebendary of Bristol, afterwards of Westminster, who had been interested in American colonization from the time of Raleigh's expeditions. Around him were gathered many eminent and energetic men, among them Sir George Calvert, the future founder of Maryland, but none of greater promise, in relation to the work before them, than Bartholomew Gosnold, the settler of Elizabeth's Island, and John Smith, a hero in the east long before he turned his face westward. Gosnold and Smith were both amongst the first colonists.

Jamestown.

It was in midwinter, (December 19, 1606,) that an expedition, one hundred strong, set out from England. A feeble band as regarded their individual resources, they were strong in the company by which they were sent to stranger shores. The voyage was long, by the common route of the West Indies, but Virginia was reached at last. The spring (May 13, 1607) saw the beginning of the first English town in America. Its royal name of Jamestown is now a name alone.

New charters.

The company had hardly begun its work when it sought new powers. Three years after the patent, a second charter was framed, giving additional authority to the English company, and extending the American limits to the latitude of Philadelphia, (1609.) Three years later, (1612,) a third charter vested the powers of the company in a General Court of the members, and added the Bermuda Islands to their domains. If charters were all that the company needed in order to flourish, it bade fair to be great and enduring.

The fortunes of the colony were less promising. Some-

Fortunes of the colony.

times at peace, sometimes at war* with the natives, sometimes contented, sometimes despairing amongst themselves, the colonists went through great vicissitudes. One cause of feebleness is plain enough; it is the entire dependence of the colony upon the company and the company's representatives. Another cause of equal moment was the variety of rank and of character in the colony. The gentleman and the felon, the ardent seeker after adventure and the patient toiler for subsistence, the freeman, the apprentice, and the slave,† made up a community too mixed to possess any steadiness of growth. The three first years, (1607–9,) the colonists hung upon John Smith, who had become their president in the year following the settlement of Jamestown. It is curious to see how he led, rebuked, supported them; he, as the strong man, guiding them, as feeble children. One year, (1610,) the colony is all but abandoned; another, (1613,) it is strong enough to make the attack already mentioned upon the French settlements in the north. But the tendency to increase, though interrupted, continues, and not without support from the company in England.

Institutions.

The first step to raise the colonists from a state of mere vassalage was the grant of an estate to each settler, (1615.) The progress from the landholder to the freeman followed. The colony had been bound, as has been stated, to maintain the church of England. Its civil authorities consisted, first of the English crown and Parliament, then of the English council, then of the English company, by which, according to the various charters, the local officers were appointed. These were, in the beginning, a council, with a president; but in a year or two from the beginning, a governor and suite, at first with-

* The Indian wars are related in Part II. Chapter IV.

† A Dutch man of war brought the first negro slaves, in 1620.

out and afterwards with a council. At length, under the government of Sir George Yeardley, the freemen of the colony, representing eleven corporations or plantations, were called, as burgesses, to a General Assembly, to take the matter of taxes, besides other affairs of importance, into their own hands, (1619.) This was the system of the colonial constitution granted by the company two years afterwards, (1621.) In other words, the executive authority was in the hands of a governor, the judicial in those of a governor and a council, with an appeal to an Assembly, and the legislative in that of a governor, a council, and an Assembly, all subject to the company, which, of course, was subject to the laws and the authorities of England.

An infant colony.

We are apt to exaggerate the importance of the English settlements, in comparison with those of the French or the Spanish, or any other nation in our country. The truth is, that Virginia, like most of the settlements which we shall find in the north, was but an infant colony, unable to regulate its trade or its education, its habits of life or of thought, except in submission to external authorities. One or two examples, occurring under the company's jurisdiction, illustrate the dependence of the colony during the entire period of which we are now treating. A design of a college for native as well as English youth, started in England with large subscriptions, found no fulfilment in Virginia, (1619–21.) Even the want of wives was met, not by individual devotion, but by a company speculation; a large number of young women of good character being transported to be sold for a hundred and twenty, or even a hundred and fifty pounds of tobacco (at three shillings a pound) to the lonely settlers, (1620–21.)

Fall of the company.

Nothing, however, marks the utter dependence of the colony so plainly as its inactivity during the troubles in which the company became involved.

Dissensions amongst the members, and jealousies amongst those who were not members, led to the royal interference; the result being the fall of the company, with all its expenditures* heavy on its head, (1624.) The colony at this time numbered about two thousand, the relics of nine thousand who had been sent out. Yet for all the two thousand did to prove their existence or their independence, the colony might have been supposed to be the company's shadow, too unsubstantial to support or to oppose the power to which it owed its being.

Virginia a royal province.

Virginia became a royal province. The governor and the council received their appointment from the king, the freemen continuing to elect their Assembly. It was a national government, instead of a corporation system, and as such it seemed to relieve the Virginians. At any rate, they grew so much in spirit as to make a stand against the royal grant of what they considered their territory to the proprietor of Maryland. Their governor, John Harvey, not taking part with them as they wished, they deposed him, and sent him virtually a prisoner to England, (1635.) The king, of course, restored the governor, but without reducing the colony to silence or to retribution, (1636–37.) The spirit of dependence, however, lingered.

Growth of the colony.

But the principles of growth and of independence were at work. Among the earliest settlers were men of culture and of earnestness, men who, like Alexander Whitaker, "a scholar, a graduate, and a preacher," devoted themselves to the elevation of the colony. Among the earliest governors were Lord De la Ware, (1611,) and Sir George Yeardley, (1619–21,) both of strong character and of strong influence. Around such individuals as these there would naturally gather an in-

* From £100,000 to £150,000.

creasing number and a higher stamp of colonists. The interest of the mother country in the colony would naturally be extended when the dissolution of the company opened the way to general emigration and general enterprise. The development of Virginia seemed sure.

THE PLYMOUTH COMPANY.

Members. Among the members of the Plymouth Company were many personages of distinction. The lord chief justice of England, Sir John Popham, the governor of Plymouth, Sir Ferdinando Gorges, and two Gilberts, kinsmen and successors of Sir Humphrey Gilbert and Sir Walter Raleigh, all engaged in the enterprise. The higher the rank, however, of individual members in any association, the more likely, in most cases, are clashing pretensions and menacing divisions. The Plymouth Company never held together in such a way as to carry out any effective operations.

Colonization attempted. A few members made the first move by sending out a colony of forty-five persons, who encamped for one brief year upon an island at the mouth of the Kennebec, (1607–8.) Some time elapsed before any new expedition was undertaken. Nor would any, it is probable, have been undertaken then, but for the active agency of John Smith, who, four or five years after his return from Virginia, entered the service of the Plymouth Company. A careful voyage from the Penobscot to Cape Cod impressed him so favorably, that he gave the country the name of New England, obtaining for himself the title of its admiral, (1614.) But his persevering exertions to discharge his office and to colonize his chosen land were in vain; nor was any thing more attempted by the company until it was transformed by a new charter into the

Council of Plymouth for New England, with the right to all the territory from the latitude of Philadelphia to that of Chaleur Bay, (1620.)

Various proprietors and companies.

Even then, the Council for New England set on foot no colonization of its own. Its energies seemed to be spent in making grants to individuals, — some of them its members, — or to associations, by whom the settlement of New England was to be accomplished. Singular enough, considering that it was New England, a large proportion of these subordinate agencies was directed to the establishment of what may be called a number of lordly domains upon the soil. In following this succession of proprietors and of companies, we lose sight of the Council for New England.

Settlement of Plymouth.

One settlement, originally made without a grant from the council, was by much the most important for many years. It was on no large scale. One hundred and two passengers in the Mayflower landed at a place already called New Plymouth, (December 11, 1620.) They were a band of Puritans, whose extreme principles had led to their exile, first from England to Holland, (1608,) and then from Holland to America. Obtaining a grant from the London Company, they set sail for Virginia, but landed to the north of that province, in the limits of New England. The year following, they procured a patent from the Council for New England, (1621.) But not in their own name; the grant being made to one of a company of London merchants, with whom they had formed a partnership before sailing to the west. The Londoners, holding their title under the council, thus constituted a sort of company within a company. Nor was it until after six years, marked by many troubles and by many injuries, that the colonists extricated themselves from this twofold dependence by the payment

of a large sum to the London merchants, (1626.) The difficulties with the merchants had been the least of the trials of the Plymouth settlers. Half of the one hundred and two of the Mayflower died within a year from the landing. "In the time of most distress," says the historian of the settlement, Governor Bradford, "there were but six or seven sound persons." After disease came want; "all their victuals were spent, and they were only to rest on God's providence; at night not many times knowing where to have a bit of any thing the next day." When a ship load of fresh immigrants arrived nearly two years after, "the best dish they," the earlier comers, "could present their friends with, was a lobster or a piece of fish, without bread or any thing else but a cup of fair spring water." Nevertheless the Pilgrims, as they were called, sustained and extended their settlements. A second patent from the council was obtained for the country near the mouth of the Kennebec, where a trading post was presently established, (1628.) The whole extent of settlements, both at Plymouth and on the Kennebec, was included in a third patent, two years afterwards, (1630.)

Its distinction in history.

One who reads the history of these times without personal or national prepossessions will not find any thing of a very extraordinary character in the settlement of Plymouth. They who came thither, braving the perils of the unknown sea and the unknown shore, were but doing what had been done by their countrymen in Virginia, and by others in other settlements in America. Solemnity is certainly imparted to their enterprise by the reflection that they came to maintain the doctrines and laws which their consciences approved, but which the authorities of England proscribed. Yet the Huguenots of Carolina had done the same thing more than half a century before. The true distinction

of the Puritans of Plymouth is this, that they relied upon themselves, that they adopted their own institutions and developed their own resources, of course in a feeble, but not the less in a manly manner. Before they landed, they "covenant and combine themselves together into a civil body politic, to enact such just and equal laws as shall be thought most convenient for the general good of the colony." The state thus founded was continued in entire independence of external authority, except in so far as its territory was held by grants from the Council for New England.

Political forms.

The political forms of Plymouth were singularly simple. Every settler of good character — that is, of the faith of the colony, and not an apprentice or a servant — was a freeman, a member of the body by which all affairs were administered or directed. An assembly of a representative character was not held for nearly twenty years, (1639.) Out of the freemen a smaller body was taken to exercise the every-day functions of government. It was composed merely of the governor and his assistants, or council, of which he was simply the presiding officer with a double vote. The first governor was John Carver; the second was William Bradford, who retained the post, with a few interruptions, for thirty-six years. It marks the simplicity, not to say the distastefulness, of these offices, that there should have been a law subjecting a man not having served the preceding year, and yet refusing to be governor, to a fine of twenty pounds, equivalent to a much larger amount in our day. A military body was headed by Miles Standish, the hero of the settlement.

Spirit.

But the spirit beneath these forms is of more importance than the forms themselves. The earnest faith of the Puritans was at once the source from which

the colony sprang, and the strength by which it grew. But it was also the principle of harsh and arbitrary measures. It transformed the exiles into persecutors, many of whose companions found themselves again exiles, escaping from the mother country only to be thrust out from the sandy coasts and chilly hovels of the colony.

Grants. Attempt at general government. Chaos.

Meantime New England was portioned out under various names. The secretary of the council, John Mason, called his grant Mariana, stretching from Salem River to the head of the Merrimac, (1621.) The lands between the Merrimac and the Kennebec were presently combined as Laconia, in a grant made to Mason in company with Sir Ferdinando Gorges, (1622.) The first settlement, however, in that neighborhood was made by some fishermen on the shore near Monhegan Island, beyond the Kennebec, and therefore independently of Mason and Gorges, (1622.) The next year the sites of the later Portsmouth and Dover were occupied, each under a separate association, to which the two proprietors had partially transferred their claims, (1623.) Meanwhile the Council for New England had been attempting great things, commissioning Captain Francis West as "Admiral of New England," Captain Robert Gorges as "Governor General," and the Rev. William Morrell as "Overseer of Churches." The last named was a clergyman of the English church. "He had," says Governor Bradford, "I know not what power and authority of superintendency over other churches granted him, and sundry instructions for that end, but he never showed it or made any use of it." "It should seem," says the stout Puritan, "he saw it was in vain; he only spoke of it to some here at his going away." The governor general and the admiral cut no better figure. The council, as if disgusted by the fate of their general officers, surrendered

their domains to chaos. New grants, within as well as without the limits of those already made, were issued by the council, or by members of the council; the whole coast from Plymouth to the Penobscot being cut up with dividing and intersecting lines.

New Hampshire and New Somersetshire.

Order began to be evolved. The partnership between Mason and Ferdinando Gorges being dissolved, (1629,) each obtained a new grant for himself. Mason gave the name of New Hampshire to the tract between the Merrimac (afterwards between the Salem) and the Piscataqua Rivers. The district between the Piscataqua and the Kennebec was called New Somersetshire by Gorges, who donned the title of Governor General of New England. "There was a consultation had," writes an Englishman at the time, "to send him thither with a thousand soldiers." The scheme of a general government was not yet abandoned, (1634.)

Cape Ann and Salem.

A company of Puritans in England had some time before acquired a fishing station of the Plymouth colony at Cape Ann, (1624.) Thither a few settlers were sent; Roger Conant being soon after invited to be the governor, (1625.) He was a man of great spirit, who had found it prudent to leave Plymouth in consequence of his too liberal Puritanism, and who now sustained the puny colony on the cape by his courage and his judgment. Perceiving a much better position at Naumkeag, he removed thither, (1626,) and there held the ground with a few dispirited adherents until, in accordance with his recommendation, nearly a hundred settlers arrived from England under the conduct of John Endicott, (1628.) Endicott took the direction of the colony as the agent of a new company, by which a grant of the tract between the Charles and the Merrimac Rivers had been procured from the Council for New England. The name

of Naumkeag was changed to Salem in the ensuing year, (1629.)

Company of Massachusetts Bay.

New associates having joined the enterprise, — John Winthrop, Isaac Johnson, and others of note from Boston, — a royal charter was procured for "The Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England." A governor, deputy governor, and eighteen assistants or councillors, were appointed to hold monthly courts and to conduct the affairs of administration. The members at large were to be convened from time to time in general courts, by which officers were to be chosen and laws enacted, subject only to the condition of conforming to the laws of England. No mention of religion or of religious liberty was made, it being out of the question for the Puritans to obtain the formal recognition of their own faith. Thus going behind the grant of the Council for New England, the Massachusetts association obtained an independent position, in the same character that belonged to the council itself, as an English corporation. But four months after the date of the charter, it was decided, on the proposal of the governor, Matthew Cradock, "to transfer the government of the plantation to those that shall inhabit there," (July 28, 1629.) This at once changed the corporation from an English to a colonial one.

Boston.

Reënforcements had been sent out to the colony at Salem, (1629.) But the accessions to the list were now so great as to suggest the increase of settlements. The appointment of John Winthrop as governor, under the transfer of the charter to the colony, was followed by "the great emigration," so called, of about one thousand, who, after tarrying at Salem and the neighboring Charlestown, voted "that Trimountain shall be called Boston," (September 7, 1630,) and there took up their position at the centre

of Massachusetts Bay. The first General Court was held soon after, (October 19,) and from that time Boston took the lead of Massachusetts and of New England. It was entitled to do so in Massachusetts by the rank, the education, and the devotion of its settlers. It was entitled to do so in New England as the chief place in Massachusetts, then, and for many years after, the most important of all the English settlements.

Increase and independence.

The new colony grew apace. All around Boston there sprang up towns, some on spots previously occupied by individuals or by parties, but many in districts hitherto unvisited. Each new settlement contributed to the increase and the independence of the colony. So independent in some respects did its position become, that the Council for New England, sometimes as a body and sometimes through its individual members, began to dread and to resist the rising power. There was full enough in the attitude of the Massachusetts colonists to warrant the suspicion of Sir Ferdinando Gorges, "that they would in short time wholly shake off the royal jurisdiction of the sovereign magistrate."

Charter government.

No colony certainly had ever been endowed with similar powers. Charter government had hitherto been confined to companies in England. It was first inspired with all its vitality in Massachusetts. As the government, not merely of a corporation, but of a state, it invested its holders with an authority independent of all besides a mere allegiance to the crown and the law of the mother land. The officers elsewhere, as in the royal province of Virginia, appointed in England, were here elected on the spot, and by those over whom they were to preside. Governor, council, and assembly, all belonged to and proceeded from the freemen. With them resided every form of authority, save only the distant and the indefinite shapes of royal and parliamentary supremacy.

Puritan principles.

It by no means followed that the government was a liberal one. Whatever it might appear to be in the abstract, its operation was rigidly controlled by Puritan principles. These narrowed its sphere and stiffened its action. An early vote declared no one a freeman under the charter who was not a church member, (1631.) As but a small proportion of the inhabitants were church members, there were less freemen than non-freemen. The privileges of the charter being thus restricted to the pale of the church, the church and the state became virtually one. The elders of the church, clerical and lay, were as much magistrates as the magistrates themselves.

External relations.

Such a system favored the independence of the colony in its relations with the mother country; indeed, in all external relations. It made the colony strong in itself, relying upon its own resources, providing for its own wants. The villages of Massachusetts were hardly begun, its fields were hardly turned up by the plough, when the General Court "agree to give four hundred pounds towards a school or college," (1636.) This was subsequently located at Cambridge, and named after its first private benefactor, John Harvard, a clergyman of Charlestown, (1638.) The same year of the grant from the court, when such a sacrifice for the future must have strained the entire colony, the offer of certain noblemen to join the settlers, on condition of preserving their hereditary honors, was rejected, (1636.) All the while the colony was contending against the machinations of its adversaries in and out of the Council for New England. The charter, threatened again and again, was at length demanded back; but the men of Massachusetts stood firm, and it was spared, (1634–38.)

Internal relations.

The internal relations of the colonists were by no means equally secure. The system that cut

down the charter itself was not likely to respect the development of the individual. The very members of the ruling class were under the most rigid restraint. John Eliot, afterwards the missionary to the Indians, was obliged to retract the censures which he passed upon the magistrates for making an Indian treaty without consulting the freemen, (1634.) Israel Stoughton, a deputy, who ventured to write against the pretensions of the magistrates to a negative upon the General Court, was forced to ask that his manuscript "be burned as weak and offensive," and was then excluded from office for three years, (1635.) Roger Williams, denying the power of the magistrates to compel attendance upon their form of service, or to bind the conscience by human laws, was driven into exile, (1635.) It marks the spirit of the place, that even Roger Williams, the professed advocate of religious liberty, should have transgressed the very principle which he advocated, by forbidding his wife to pray with him because she would not join his scission from the church at Salem. These were all individual instances. There presently arose a party in opposition to the dominant system. It was led by a woman, Anne Hutchinson; but many of the principal men united with her in setting up what they termed a "covenant of grace" against the "covenant of works" upheld by the Puritan rulers. The leaders of the party were all banished, (1638.) One cannot wonder that William Blackstone, an early settler, who first invited the Massachusetts emigrants to settle at Boston, should retire before them, exclaiming, "I left England because I liked not the lord bishops, and now I like not the lord brethren."

Connecticut. The Massachusetts people were already emigrating. A neighboring territory, conveyed by the Council for New England to the Earl of Warwick, passed into the hands of Lord Say and Seal, Lord Brook, and others,

(1632.) Upon their domain, a party from Plymouth established a trading post, (1633,) while another and a larger company from Massachusetts founded actual settlements at Windsor and Hartford, together called the Connecticut colony, (1635.) John Winthrop, son of the Massachusetts governor, and afterwards governor of Connecticut, led the first expedition on the part of the proprietors, and began a settlement at Saybrook, (1635.) A third colony was begun, a year or two later, by emigrants from England under the lead of John Davenport and Theophilus Eaton, who, intending to settle in Massachusetts, were driven by the dissensions of that colony to New Haven, (1638.)

Providence and Rhode Island.

Connecticut was not the only colony to profit by the strifes in Massachusetts. Roger Williams, the exile, began the plantation of Providence, (1636.) As the founder of a colony, with the consent of the natives, to whom, as well as to his persecuting countrymen, he was a faithful friend, Williams deserves a far higher fame than he would ever have won as an agitator. He was followed by some of the Hutchinson exiles, who began a second colony on the northern shore of the island since called Rhode Island, (1638.) They, like Williams, obtained their lands from the natives.

Dissolution of the council.

The Council for New England, with or without whose patents so many settlements had been made, was now no more. Opposed by the advocates of a free fishery and a free trade, it had lately met with fresh assaults from those who regarded the churches of Plymouth and of Massachusetts as the offspring of schism and of sin. The council was weary of itself. Its efforts after a general government of the colonies had miscarried. Its grants had ceased to be in demand; indeed, in an honest point of view, there were no more to be made. Its

members, however, thought differently, and having once more parcelled out the territory of New England amongst themselves, they surrendered their patent to the crown, (1635.)

End of companies.

Thus ended the companies created by the patent of Virginia. One, lasting but eighteen years, began the single colony of Virginia. The other, continuing eleven years more, did not found a solitary settlement. It saw, however, quite a number of settlements made by others under its grants or upon its lands. The only office that either company had fulfilled, was to clear the way for individual enterprise. This done, both fell, and without a regret from any side.

Position of New England.

When the Virginia Company came to an end, its colony was declared a royal province. No such change ensued upon the dissolution of the Council for New England. Massachusetts, the chief settlement in the territory, was already provided with a royal charter. The other settlements were too insignificant to attract legislation, even if they attracted attention from England. Many of them, like Plymouth, were able to govern themselves. The rest would be provided for in time.

Thomas Morton.

It was plain, however, that the New England colonies needed some other system than they had to establish their relations amongst themselves. An instance in point occurs in the case of Thomas Morton "of Clifford's Inn, gentleman," as he called himself. Taking the lead of a few settlers encamped at Mount Wollaston, near Boston, he gave the hill the name of Mare-Mount, of which he styled himself "Mine Host," (1626.) The use of the church liturgy and the confidence of the Indians, whom he employed as his huntsmen, gave great umbrage to the neighboring colonists, the more so that he led a free and easy, perhaps a sensual, life upon his mount, and thus

attracted numbers from the surrounding settlements. A sort of crusade was started by "the chief of the straggling plantations," as Governor Bradford of Plymouth describes them; Plymouth, at their request, assuming the lead, and sending a party under Miles Standish to take Morton prisoner. He was sent to England, (1628.) As he had the audacity to return, he was apprehended by the authorities of the infant colony of Massachusetts Bay, whose charter covered his territory. The court ordered him to "be set in the bilboes, and after sent prisoner to England," his goods being seized and his house burned for wrongs, it was alleged, that had been done to the Indians, (1630.) After appealing to the privy council by petition, and to the English nation in a work called "New English Canaan," Morton returned again to encounter fine and imprisonment, (1643,) and to die in poverty, (1646.) Whatever were his faults, whether "the lord of misrule," as his adversaries represented him, or not, Thomas Morton was certainly handled by his fellow-colonists in a way the most opposed to justice and to peace.

Section III. — *Proprietors.* 1630 *to* 1638.

Grant of Maryland.

A new form of grant appears. Hitherto, the individual obtaining possession of territory procured it, like Mason or like Gorges, from a company to whose authority the acquisition was subject. It was by a patent from the crown that Sir George Calvert, Lord Baltimore, was made "lord and proprietor" of a tract between the Potomac River and the latitude of Philadelphia, (1632.) To this he gave the name of Maryland, and thither, to a settlement named St. Mary's, his son, after the father's death, led a band of two hundred, (1634.)

Thus was constituted a proprietary government. The

A proprietary government.

proprietor held an authority that was supreme, save in its subordination to the sovereign from whom it emanated. He directed the administration and the legislation of the colony, appointing the executive officers, the governor, especially, as his representative, and controlling the proceedings of the colonists in their assemblies. To him likewise belonged the quitrents, or taxes upon occupied lands, in addition to the general taxes for the support of the government. The colonists, on their part, — that is, "the freemen of the province," — were to have their assembly, in which their "advice, consent, and approbation" might be given or withheld in relation to the course of the proprietor.

Religious liberty.

As with other settlements, so with Maryland, there are exaggerations in some of the histories. A vast deal of fine writing has been devoted to the magnanimity with which the Maryland charter provided for religious liberty. The instrument makes no mention of the subject, or of the establishment of religion, except to leave the matter to the proprietor, subject on this point, as on others, to the laws of England. The Calvert family, being Roman Catholic, could not make their own faith paramount, nor would they, perhaps, have done so, even if they could. They wanted settlers of all creeds, whose numbers and whose energies alone could give real value to their domains. It was simply a matter of policy, therefore, with the proprietary family, to let the question of religion rest exactly where it was left by the charter. We may hope that they were not merely politic enough, but generous enough, even in an age which knew little of generosity, to throw open their province to Christians, without any limitation in favor of one branch or of another.

Troubles.

The colony, young as it was, fell into troubles. Its assembly began to make laws without waiting

for the proprietor's legal initiative. At the same time, both proprietor and assembly were involved in disturbances excited by a member of the Virginia council, William Clayborne. Virginia herself took it ill that her territory should be invaded even by royal grants. Clayborne conceived his rights to be assailed, inasmuch as he, individually, had established trading posts within the Maryland limits. Taking up arms against the colony, he was overpowered, and sent back to Virginia, (1635.)

Other proprietors.

Other proprietors, besides those of Maryland, were in the field. Sir Robert Heath, attorney general to Charles I., obtained the patent of a vast region on the south of Virginia, and as far as the Gulf of Mexico. This he called Carolana, (1630.) Another tract, called New Albion, and including the present New Jersey, was conveyed in an irregular instrument from the viceroy of Ireland to Sir Edward Plowden, as an earl palatine, (1636.) These were but grants, not settlements, yet significant of the growing pretensions of England to the soil of America.

Conclusion. English motives.

No other nation of Europe, it need hardly be suggested, had made any settlements, individual, associated, or national, at all comparable to those of the English. Nor had there been any such definite purposes of settlement, separate from mere adventure, on the part of any other race. The English settler was emphatically a settler, rather than a treasure seeker or a conqueror, a missionary or a trader. Not that he shrank from other enterprises, but that his main motive was to gain a home, and an abiding one, in the western world. Acting in harmony with this were the desire to escape from oppression or from want, the yearning after a new faith or a new life, the various impulses that have appeared, it is

hoped, in the preceding pages. That there were baser instincts tending to the same end has also appeared.

Institutions. The institutions of the English were favorable to their purposes as settlers. The subjects of a limited monarchy, they brought with them the habits and the laws of comparative freemen. That they might have been freer in their political principles, needs not to be suggested anew. But in their varying charters, in their varying magistrates and tribunals, even in the least liberal, the English colonists possessed privileges to which neither the Frenchman nor the Spaniard in their neighborhood had ever actually aspired.

Circumstances. Of an equally encouraging description were the circumstances of the English. The seaboard was theirs, all at least that they could immediately occupy. The portion which they possessed was partly in the north and partly in the south, provided, therefore, with the resources of both regions, at the same time that it was not exposed either to the indulgence of the extreme south or to the privation of the extreme north. Within opened an interior region rich in its streams, its fields, its forests, its mountains; without lay the broad sea, accessible at a hundred harbors. Whatever mere position could effect was promised to the English settlers.

English names. As yet they had but begun the work before them. Their humble towns on the coast, their humbler villages and hamlets in the country, gave small token of their destinies. But the names of their territories were full of strength and of grandeur. There was New Albion on the Pacific, New Albion on the Atlantic. There was the land of Queen Elizabeth — Virginia; there was the land of the nation — New England.

CHAPTER VI.

Dutch Settlements.

Group of traders. A LATER group of settlers comes forward. It is composed not so much of settlers, however, as of traders, who, to carry out their commercial operations, lay the foundations of a state, and give it the name of their nation.

Spirit in Holland. The spirit of the preceding half century in Holland had been that of a people rescuing themselves from a foreign dominion and building up a power of their own. Europe has nothing so brilliant upon its records at the time as the war of independence which the Netherlands waged, and waged successfully, against Spain. It might have been argued that such a nation would have surpassed all others in America.

Dwindled in America. But it was not so. The Dutch came late upon the scene. They came, moreover, not with the spirit or the law of their nation so much as with those of the commercial companies by which they were sent out or controlled. The story of their settlements is therefore an anomaly in the history of American colonization. The fire of the mother-land languishes in the colony. It is because the colony is not a national, but a corporate settlement, from its beginning to its end.

Hudson's voyage. The very year in which Holland became independent, (1609,) Henry Hudson, an Englishman in Dutch employ, sailed in search of a northern passage to

the Pacific. Shut out by the ice from his projected course, he steered westward, and reaching the coast of Maine, cruised southward as far as Virginia, giving to Cape Cod, on the way, the name of New Holland. As he returned towards the north, he discovered Delaware Bay, and entered the River of the Mountains, as he called the stream since known by his own name. These waters, first visited, perhaps, by Cabot in the English, (1498,) then by Verrazzani in the French, (1524,) and then by Gomez in the Spanish (1525) service, were now more thoroughly explored by Hudson. As their discoverer, he returned to Holland, and as their possessors, the Dutch sent out various vessels to trade with the natives and to claim the shores, (1610–13.)

Company of New Netherland.

The earliest of the Dutch posts was on the Island of Manhattan, (1613.) There the first craft of European construction was built and launched by Adrian Block, whose ship had been destroyed by fire. In his Manhattan vessel, appropriately called the Restless, Block went through Long Island Sound as far as Cape Cod, then, leaving his name for Block Island, he returned home, (1614.) The prospects of the new country looking well, the association of Amsterdam and Hoorn merchants, by whom Block and other explorers had been employed, gave it the name of New Netherland, and applied to the States General for protection in their enterprise. This was obtained, in the shape of an exclusive right for three years "to visit and penetrate the said lands lying in America between New France and Virginia, whereof the coasts extend from the fortieth to the forty-fifth degrees of latitude;" that is, from Delaware to Passamaquoddy Bay. The association, taking the name of the United New Netherland Company, set themselves to work, (1614.) A fort was built at Manhattan; a fortified trading post was established up the river, near the present Albany, (1615.)

Meanwhile the little Restless, commanded by Cornelius Hendricksen, was exploring the coast to the southward, and ascending the Delaware, then called the South River, to distinguish it from the North, or Prince Maurice's River, as the Hudson was variously styled.

Proposals of the Plymouth Puritans.

The monopoly of the New Netherland Company expiring without their being able to obtain its renewal, other parties entered into the trading operations of which the colony was the centre. But the old company, or rather a portion of its members, retained a sort of vantage ground. To them, accordingly, the Puritan exiles in Holland — the same who settled Plymouth — addressed their proposals of emigrating to New Netherland. The party to whom the application was made petitioned the States General that the Puritans might be taken under the national protection, in which case the petition asserts "upwards of four hundred families" "from this country and from England" would settle in the Dutch colony, (February, 1620.) The prayer of the petitioners was refused.

West India Company.

The New Netherland Company had ceased to be a body in which the nation confided. An old project of a West India Company was revived, and a corporation of that name established, with power, not only over New Netherland, but the entire American coast, (1621.) It was some time before the company began its operations; but when it did begin, it was evidently in earnest, (1623.)

Walloon colony.

Ten years had elapsed since the trading post on Manhattan had been occupied, and there were still none but trading posts in all New Netherland. Not a colony worthy of the name as yet existed. The only plan that had ever been formed of establishing one came from the Plymouth Puritans. It is a singular coincidence that

the first colony to be actually established was one of refugees, like the Puritans, from persecution. These were a band of Protestant Walloons, from the Spanish Netherlands, who, after applying unsuccessfully to the London Company of England, enlisted as colonists under the West India Company of Holland. Sent out in the first expedition of the company, they settled at Waal-bogt, or Walloons' Bay, on the western shore of Long Island, (1623–24.) Their settlement stands out amidst the surrounding trading posts as the one spot of home life in New Netherland. But it was a feeble settlement, and feeble it continued, although recruited by fresh fugitives from beyond the sea.

New Amsterdam. The company was by no means absorbed in its Walloons. On the contrary, it was erecting forts, one on the North River, another on the South, and presently, the chief of all on Manhattan Island, (1626.) Purchasing the entire island from the natives for no less than twenty-four of our dollars, Peter Minuit, the company's director, commenced the erection of a fort, with some surrounding dwellings, to which the name of New Amsterdam was subsequently applied. This settlement was to New Netherland the same principal place that it has since become as New York to the United States. Other forts were gradually raised; that of Good Hope upon the Connecticut, and that of Beversrede upon the Schuylkill, (1633.) The dominion of the company was in force upon the soil not only of New York, but of Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, and all within ten years of its first operations.

Patroons. But upon this vast surface the company's settlements were as dots. Several of them, indeed, had been obliterated, and of those that remained, hardly one besides New Amsterdam was any thing more than a sta-

tion for trade. New Amsterdam itself was only a commercial settlement. Other posts of the same character had been begun, but the colony, as a whole, was in a languishing condition; the company, of course, being disappointed in their expectations of rich returns. To advance their interests, they offered a slice of territory and the title of patroon to any one who, within a given period, would settle a given number of colonists upon lands bought of the natives, (1629.) This regard for the Indians was not the only proof of liberality in the patroon system, as it may be styled. The support of a clergyman and a schoolmaster, with that of a "comforter for the sick," was especially enjoined as one of the conditions to be fulfilled by the patroons. But mixed up with the more generous provisions were others of a very opposite nature. The fur trade, the great attraction of New Netherland, was reserved exclusively to the company. Pain of banishment was to deter the colonists from "making woollen, linen, or cotton cloths." "As many negroes as can be conveniently provided" were promised to the Dutch settlers. All the while, the patroons were constituted a class of feudal lords, as threatening to their superiors in the company as to their inferiors in the colony. Large purchases were made by individuals, (1629–31,) and some settlements were attempted, the chief being those of Rensselaerswyck, near Albany, Pavonia, opposite Manhattan Island, and Swaanendael, on the Delaware. Some of these reverted to the company; some disappeared.

English claims.

Spain and France, as we have read, had their pretensions to the soil of New Netherland. But the only power to dispute the Dutch possession was England. Tradition asserts that the same Captain Argal who destroyed the French settlement in Maine visited the huts on Manhattan Island, as he was returning to Virginia, and

compelled the few Dutchmen whom he found there to acknowledge the English supremacy, (1613.) This is uncertain; but it is certain that when the New Netherland Company appealed to the States General in behalf of the Plymouth Puritans, they represented the danger of the colony's being surprised by an expedition sent to support the claims of England, (1620.) The Council for New England was soon engaged in appealing to the Privy Council against what they deemed to be an invasion of their territory. The appeal was received, and an order of inquiry into the circumstances went to the British ambassador in Holland. He replied that there was as yet no Dutch colony upon the soil, (1621.) But as time passed, and colonies were founded, the suspicions of the English, both in England and in America, were revived. A correspondence, opened by Peter Minuit, director of New Amsterdam, with William Bradford, governor of New Plymouth, stirred the Englishman to ask that the Dutch should trade no more in his neighborhood; and further, that they should clear their title to trade or to settle in any part of the country at all. No wonder that Minuit applied to the company in Holland for forty soldiers, (1627.) On his voyage home, a few years later, Minuit and his ship were detained on touching at Plymouth in England, and to the remonstrance of the Dutch embassy, the British ministry formally opposed the title of Great Britain to New Netherland, (1632.) It was soon after that the English settlements in Connecticut began to crowd upon the fort of the Dutch, (1633–38,) while a direct invasion of Delaware was made from Virginia, (1635.) This was repelled; but the soil of Connecticut could not be retained.

Trade of the colony.

The colony was still a colony of traders. No generous views, no manly energies, were as yet excited amongst its inhabitants or its rulers. From

the slave to the colonist, from the colonist to the patroon, from the patroon to the director, and even from the director to the company, there was little besides struggling for pecuniary advantages. It was esteemed a great era in the colony when, after various dissensions, its trade was nominally thrown open. But the percentages to the company were such as to prevent any really free trade, (1638.)

CHAPTER VII.

Swedish Settlements.

Idea of Gustavus Adolphus.

Last of all to claim a share as a nation in our territory were the Swedes. Their far-sighted and large-hearted king, Gustavus Adolphus, the champion of the Protestant cause in Europe, caught up the idea of supporting the same cause in America. "It is the jewel of my kingdom," he wrote just before he died, concerning the settlement that was yet to be, (1632.)

Oxenstiern calls in Germany.

The jewel of Gustavus received its setting from the regent of his infant daughter Christina, the Chancellor Oxenstiern. With the same loftiness of view, — preparing a state that was to be of benefit to "all Christendom," — Oxenstiern invited and obtained the coöperation of Protestant Germany, (1634.) The Swedish West India Company was to be the instrument by which the north of Europe, as well as Sweden, was to be linked to America. It was a design of greater ends and of broader motives than had as yet been formed for the new world.

Results.

But the results bore no proportion to the plans. It was not to be expected that such colonists as could be found in Sweden would embrace the same wide objects as their regent or their king. They would enlist only in an enterprise that promised personal as well as national returns. Some years passed before any settlement was attempted, and then a colony of only twenty-four, and

these chiefly transported convicts, was established at Fort Christina, near the present Wilmington in Delaware, (1638.) The territory, which was purchased of the Indians, extended on either side of the fort, along the western shore of Delaware Bay, and up the Delaware River as far as Trenton, under the name of New Sweden.

Opposing claims.

To this the Swedes had been guided by Peter Minuit, lately of New Netherland. His recommendation of lands previously purchased and occupied, though just at this time unoccupied, by his countrymen, involved the Swedish colony in immediate difficulties. A remonstrance from the governor of New Netherland against the invasion of his province was supported in Holland by the seizure of a Swedish vessel touching at a Dutch port on its way home. The English had their pretensions likewise to the lands appropriated by the new colony. On each side were conflicting claims. With feeble numbers and with scanty supplies, the Swedes would find it difficult to keep their New Sweden.

CHAPTER VIII.

Indian Races.

European races. The roll of European races establishing themselves independently upon our soil was filled up by Spain, France, England, Holland, Sweden, and, with Sweden, Germany. After the Swedish colony of 1638, no national settlement was made by any nation not already upon the scene.

Indian races. It is time, therefore, to take an account of the races that occupied the country before any of those from Europe entered upon their possessions. The share of the Indians in our history endures, though their share in our territory wastes away.

Names and numbers. The idea of Columbus that he had merely rediscovered India gave the name of Indians to the existing inhabitants of the continent. Within the limits of our country they were divided into four grand divisions, as the Algonquins, the Iroquois, the Mobilians, and the Dahcotas. The last name includes the tribes west of the Mississippi, of which, in the early period, the number could not have been at all considerable. Neither were the three divisions lying east of the Mississippi by any means numerous. The entire number is estimated to have been under three hundred thousand, and perhaps not above two hundred thousand, at the time of the first European settlements. Take from the whole the large part which had little or no connection with any of the European

races, and the Indian population dwindles to small proportions. It seems strange that so few, and these few savages, should have exercised so great an influence upon so many, and these many civilized. But it will be accounted for by a rapid survey of the Indian divisions and the Indian resources.

Algonquins. First of the Algonquins. The central tribe of this vast race was the Lenni-Lenape, which, occupying the shores of the Delaware, went by the name of Delawares amongst the English. The name of Lenni-Lenape, meaning Aborigines, is supposed to mark them as the parent stock of the Algonquins. The shoots of the race were enormously spread. Starting far up in the north, they stretch through New England, as the Abenakis, the Pawtuckets, the Massachusetts, the Pokanokets, the Narragansets, the Pequots, and the Mohegans. Thence they may be traced as the Manhattans of New York, the Susquehannas and the Nanticokes of Pennsylvania and Maryland, the Powhatans of Virginia, and the Pamlicos of South Carolina. Towards the west they appear as the Ottawas of Michigan, the Miamis of Ohio and Indiana, the Illinois of Illinois, and the Shawanoes of Kentucky. Long as this list is, it embraces but a portion of the names to be found in any full record of the Algonquins.

Iroquois. Next of the Iroquois. The centre of this division was among the lakes of Western New York, where the Five Nations of the Mohawks, the Oneidas, the Onondagas, the Cayugas, and the Senecas established their confederacy. To the west and north-west of the Five Nations lay their conquests of after years, the lands of the Eries, of the Hurons, and of other tribes. The prowess or the intrigue of the Iroquois had already subdued the great tribe of the Algonquins, the Lenni-Lenape. Far to the south, partly in Virginia and partly in Carolina, were

the Tuscaroras, who, at a later period, migrated to unite with their brethren in the north, making six nations of the five.

Mobilians. Lastly, of the Mobilian division. It was broken up amongst the Yamassees of Georgia; the Muskhogees or Creeks of Georgia, Alabama, and Florida; the Seminoles of Florida, with the inland tribes of Catawbas in South Carolina, Cherokees in Georgia and Alabama, Choctaws, Natchez, and Chickasaws in Alabama and Mississippi.

Customs and institutions. There was but one line of wide distinction amongst these various tribes. It separated those who lived by the chase alone from those who lived not only by the chase, but by agriculture. The former class, of course, was the ruder of the two; yet the customs and the institutions of both were much the same. The Indian was every where a hunter, every where a warrior. If he was any thing else, if he attempted agriculture or trade, he seemed to be out of his element. The habits of civilized life were a burden, sometimes a destruction to him. This is true of all the tribes upon our soil; the only customs to which they took, and by which they held, were those of the wilderness, or, at the best, of the field. Their institutions were comparatively advanced. Gathered with his kinsmen in a totem or clan, then with other clans in a tribe, then perhaps with other tribes in a confederacy, the Indian was as much a member of a nation as the European. Above him were his chiefs, the hereditary sachems of peace, and the chosen leaders of war. Their sway and his rights rested together on laws, unwritten, but not undetermined. The devotion shown to these relations and to these institutions was that of true patriots, as well as true savages. It sustained the Indians through trials under which more civilized nations have much sooner succumbed. Had it

been united with a civilization, or rather a religion, by which the different tribes could have been blended in one, beneath better statutes and holier influences, the Indian race would have left no space for the European.

Influence upon the European.

We can now appreciate the influence of the Indian upon the European. Though far from being disciplined, though still farther from being concentrated, the natives of our soil would not encounter an invader without leaving an abiding mark upon him and upon his destiny. If not numerous in proportion to the vast regions over which they were spread, they were multitudinous in proportion to the scanty settlements of the stranger. He, moreover, was in an untried land, they in one which they had occupied from infancy.

Counter influence upon the Indian.

Had there been nothing else to make the Indians formidable, the treatment which they received would have been sufficient. The white men came, if not to drag the red man into captivity, or to ransack his stores, at any rate to occupy his lands. This was done, sometimes with and sometimes without the show of justice. If any nation deserves credit above another, it is not the English, not their Puritan or their Quaker branches, as frequently boasted, but the Dutch of New Netherland. Nowhere, however, do we find more than the pretence of even dealing with the natives. The intercourse thus opened was continued in much the same fashion. The Spaniards and the French had greater numbers, proportionally, of missionaries amongst the Indians; the French, whether missionaries or not, were on comparatively good terms with many of the tribes about them. But there are no exceptions to the general course of the Indian from the time that he encountered the European. Scorn, treachery, degradation, were his portion; fury and savage warfare were his revenge. Of the Indian wars we shall take notice hereafter.

African race. As the Indian drooped beneath the blight of the stranger, and became a dependant where his fathers had been free and powerful, he came in contact with another race also in dependence upon the European. This was the African race, introduced into Virginia the same year that the Puritans came to Plymouth, bondmen from the beginning and until now.

The country. And here, as we have completed the enumeration of the races in the country, it behoves us to give a glance at the country itself, varied and wide enough, as it must have seemed, for many colonies, or many nations. Although as yet the seaboard alone was occupied, the vast reaches of the interior, the stretching plains, the penetrating rivers, were descried. Different prospects, different attractions, different influences, opened in all directions, betokening that the various races here thrown together would have no want of development amongst themselves — no want, it must be added, of strife with one another.

CHAPTER IX.

Europe from 1492 to 1638.

The great change.

At the discovery of America, there was but one church amongst the Christians of Europe. There were several churches amongst them when America was settled. It was the great change of the century and a half that had passed away.

Its cause and character.

The reformation of the Catholic church, while under the supremacy of Rome, had been the prayer of many a devout heart. The more faithful the churchman, the more sensitive he was to the corruption and to the oppression existing in a body of which the liberty and the purity were alike sacred in his eyes. But he had nowhere conceived it necessary to break the church asunder in order to reform it; he was rather the champion of a closer union than existed amongst Christians. The rupture of the church was brought about, not by the reformer, but by the anti-reformer. Every where opposed, if not crushed, the reformers of successive periods met with a fate that did but increase the tendency which it was intended to arrest. The demand for reform became more and more earnest, more and more imperative. Still refused, still met by persecution, it was supported by sterner spirits and by more violent deeds, until the crisis came, bringing not only reformation, but division.

Luther's course.

The course of things in general appears in the experience of the individual who led the outbreak

of the reformation, especially so called. When Martin Luther, an Augustine monk of Wittenberg, in Saxony, hung up on the church door a paper of ninety-five theses, or propositions, against the doctrine of indulgence, that is, of absolution without repentance, he was "a papist," as he himself said, "of the deepest dye," with no other object than that of saving the church as it was, (1517.) But rejected, buffeted, assailed in his purposes of reform, he threw off the yoke of Rome in three years' time, burning the papal bull of excommunication, and dividing the Christian church for ages, if not forever, (1520.) It was but a quarter of a century from the discovery of America.

Divisions. Once that the church was rent, divisions yawned wide on all sides. The point on which the reformation concentrated itself was resistance to the Roman sway, which was accordingly thrown off by one state after another. Some of the seceders in Germany, resisting the measures of repression with which they were threatened, made the protest from which came the name of Protestant, (1529.) Then Protestants against Protestants appeared. The doctrines put forth by one party did not fay in with those of another party in the same nation; and as different nations entered the arena, different lines of separation arose between creed and creed, between form and form. It was the reaction against ages of baffled desire and stifled conscience.

A crisis of good and evil. In presence of such dissensions amongst the believers in one Lord and one faith, there is surely no room for exultation. To regard the reformation merely as a triumph, without recognizing it as a trial of humanity, is to shut one's eyes against some of the darkest passages in human history. That it was a crisis alike of good and of evil, appears in its consequences, with which alone we are here concerned.

Religious consequences.

Take them, first, in a religious point of view. To those who altogether refused to enter into the reformation it brought a deeper subjection to existing wrongs. To those who wholly entered into it, on the other hand, who shrank from none of its extremes, it brought the oppression of new errors, wilder at least, if not more fatal, than any of the old. It was only on the middle ground, between the reckless adherent and the dogged opponent of the reformation, that they are to be found who profited by it, who returned to the truth in its moderation and its simplicity. Amongst these there was a reformation; amongst the others — those of the extremes on either side — there was rather a revolution, a convulsion.

Political consequences.

So with the consequences in a political point of view. The ruling principle of European governments, let it be remembered, was monarchy. It had raised itself to its position, let it also be remembered, by its successful strife with the papacy of Rome, of which, however, it was no more the sovereign than it was the subject. It had simply gained the ground on which, consciously or unconsciously, it might do its work of bringing forward, or of suffering to be brought forward, the social and the individual interests of the people. To maintain this place, a temperate course amid the agitations of the times was necessary. Where men rushed madly into every new scheme of government, there anarchy took the place of monarchy. It was displaced by despotism at the other extreme, where the subordination to the Roman see was unshaken. Why the state should be thus affected by movements begun in the church, will not appear singular if we reflect how similar was the necessity, how similar the desire, for reform in both.

Spain.

But to leave these general observations for the examples of them to be found amongst the states of

Europe, let us begin with the unchanging Spain, unchanging, though not without her Protestants. Yet there was no struggle between one cause and the other; the decision was sharp and resolute to the effect that the church should undergo no alteration. Naturally, therefore, the monarchy of Spain fell into a sort of dependence upon the central power of the church to which it was thus devoted. The monarch was the absolute sovereign, ruling for the priesthood, for the nobility, for himself of course, but not for his people. Beneath such a king as Philip II., (1556–98,) in whom the Spanish system, both in church and in state, found its impersonation, the energies of the nation received a blight from which they have never recovered.

France. The course of France, alike on some points, was very different as a whole. She had her massacre of St. Bartholomew, the bloodiest blow yet struck against the reformers, (1572,) before the edict of Nantes gave liberty of faith to her Protestants, the Huguenots, (1598.) But from the latter date, at all events, the position of France was that of a nation adhering to the Roman church, yet as its ally, not its subject. It was the temperate state upon the Roman side. Nowhere else did the church of Rome appear to so great advantage as where it was thus established in forbearance. Nowhere else was the state more successfully administered than where it was thus conducted in liberality. Europe saw no truer monarch during the period than Henry IV. of France, (1589–1610.)

Holland. Far on in the Protestant van was Holland. She flung herself into the reformation with a frenzy no doubt aggravated by her hatred for her mistress in Spain. The results were soon visible in scenes of pillage and blood. The Roman churches were violated; then the Protestant churches were rent asunder. In the state there were better signs. The heroic war of independence threw off the Span-

ish dominion, (1566–1609.) But to the hopes thus inspired there came a rapid reverse, with the rise of Maurice of Orange, to whom the best patriot of Holland, John Van Olden Barneveldt, fell a victim, (1619.) The Protestant extreme was quite as fatal as the Roman.

Sweden and Germany.

Sweden and Protestant Germany were calmer and happier. But the latter country was too much broken up, while the former was too much confined, to take any position of enduring influence. It is the less to our purpose to dwell upon their fortunes, inasmuch as they had but little part in the fortunes of our own country.

England.

Let us pass, therefore, to England, great in the Protestant cause, because great in the moderation by which the cause was sustained. The entrance of the nation into the lists was discreditable enough, so far as it was made at the dictates of Henry VIII., no earnest reformer, but a swollen despot. Once entered in, however, the heart of the nation beat nobly and enduringly. It went through few excesses. The passions of the early reformers were those of individuals; the austerities of the later reformers were those of a few, compared with the many who remained steadfast. The church of the reformation assumed its gentler aspect in the church of England — the mean between the extremes, alike of Protestantism and Romanism. Nor did the state altogether fail to harmonize with the church. The reign of Mary was an interruption; but that of her sister Elizabeth was more than a compensation, (1558–1603.) England was stirred to new life. Physically and intellectually, as well as morally, the nation received the impulse of the age, and bounded forward. Yet there were serious trials to come; the development that had been begun could not go on uninterrupted, its very activity occasioning retrocession at times, as well as advance.

All Europe was growing in one direction. No country

Intellectual expansion.

but was touched by an intellectual flame. Italy, far as she was from the sea that led to the new world, or from the agitation that led to the new life in the old world, — even she was radiant with science, with poesy, and with art. Galileo uttered his wondrous revelations; Ariosto and Tasso composed their glowing poems; Palestrina breathed forth his solemn strains; Michael Angelo and Raphael created their immortal forms. Spain, too, otherwise so mute or so repulsive, rang out responsive with her versatile Cervantes and her inexhaustible Lope de Vega. England, in her activity, answered with the one universal voice of Shakspeare. Bacon was the English, Descartes the French philosopher, both, but especially the latter, being at once deliverers and lawgivers to the human intellect. It was for America as well as for Europe that these marvellous works were wrought.

PART II.

THE ENGLISH DOMINION.

1638–1763.

CHAPTER I.

England and France from 1638 to 1763.

Question of precedence.

The two nations that were in the van of Europe would inevitably lead the van in America. The question of precedence between them was decided, as that of their common precedence had been, in Europe. Let us look thither in search of the controlling causes.

Reign of Louis XIV.

We shall see France submitting to the sceptre of a boy, Louis XIV., whose reign of nearly three quarters of a century (1643 to 1715) determines the point of French decline. We may call it decline, since this was the result, although the name of Great was then, and has since been given to the king, as if his government had been fruitful in grandeur and in beneficence. It was fruitful in neither. Its grandeur consisted of a dazzling court and a glittering army — elements of feebleness, as every one knows, rather than of greatness. Its beneficence was confined to courtiers and to commanders, to men not only of high but of low estate, provided they ministered to the royal will and to the royal luxury. But to be more definite.

The monarchy.

The reign of Louis was hostile to the true principle of monarchy; that is, to the principle of ruling for the good of a people. He used his power for selfish ends, in striving after which he did far more to precipitate than to secure the royal authority. If he made himself the preëminent sovereign, he did not make his nation the preeminent nation in Europe. Nor was he himself supreme

for any length of time. He saw his intrigues baffled, his armies defeated, his conquests and his resources gone, his court overshadowed, even before he ceased to rule.

The church. The one point, however, on which he failed most of all, was in relation to the national religion. He found this, it will be remembered, a moderate form of Romanism. He left it an extreme form. His displeasure bore down the liberal Romanists. His persecution crushed the Protestants. The edict of Nantes, beneath which the Protestants had found protection for nearly a century, was revoked, not without previous outrages, (1685.) Bigotry and priestcraft triumphed, but in a manner that tended to their overthrow, nay, to the jeopardy of the religion itself which they professed to uphold. No crisis in French history was more important than this. It changed the character not only of the national religion, but of the national government — even of the nation. The signs of feebleness within and of feebleness without in the administration, the disunion and the degradation amongst the people, sprang from no cause more clearly than from the transformation of the French church into a church of subjection to Rome, and of ferocity to all the world besides. It was thus chiefly that Louis left France shaken to the centre and to the base.

The nation. At the same time, the development of the French nation, begun in previous years, was not stopped. It was not even checked in some directions. Their chivalrous natures could not be turned back upon themselves. They were still the same ardent, the same generous race that they had been, more generous and more ardent than their king who was misleading them. Their higher minds gazed upwards steadily, in defiance of the errors and the wrongs around them. The names of Corneille the poet, of Pascal the philosopher, of Fenelon at once the poet, the philosopher, and the priest, bear witness to the aspirations of the French nation.

Reaction. Such an age as that of Louis XIV. was sure to be followed by a reaction. The long reign of his successor, Louis XV. (1715–74) was marked by almost every sign of degeneracy. Profligacy rather than splendor, sensuality rather than ambition, ruled at the court, while the church sank into indifference and infidelity. The people beneath these decaying oppressions is represented by Voltaire and Rousseau, both defying the corruptions in high places, yet neither believing in any principle that could restore purity or liberty.

The English nation. The English nation had its difficulties. In the first place, the people was but partially in existence. Such men as pursued their callings at home, or crossed the sea to the colonies, with any thing like independence of spirit, formed but a small class. The greater proportion were of the dependent and the inefficient. In the next place, a succession of struggles was interfering with all steadiness in the present, all security in the future.

Periods of trial. First came the period of Charles I., when the monarch excited his subjects to rebellion, (1625–49.) Next followed the period of the commonwealth, when the fierce excesses of the people threatened general ruin, (1649–59.) Then came the period of the restoration, when the brothers Charles II. and James II. renewed the arbitrary government of their father, the first Charles, without any of his principle or enthusiasm, (1660–88.) These periods were all of trial — trial to the church, trial to the state. The monarchy was in danger of falling, now into anarchy, now into tyranny. The church was in peril at one time of returning to the extreme of Romanism, and at another of falling into the extreme of Protestantism.

Revolution of 1688. From these trials it is common to say that the nation was saved by the revolution of 1688. So far as this event brought the despotism and the

extreme Romanism of James II. to an end, it did save England. But it had its own evil effects. It reduced both church and state beneath an aristocracy whose principles, on many points, were utterly adverse to the true concerns of either. There was no liberation, no elevation of the people. To them the revolution was as little a matter of interest as if it had occurred at the antipodes. The truth is, that the revolution, in itself, was but a cessation of the swayings to and fro of the preceding years. Inasmuch as it brought some measure of stability, it was a national blessing.

Aristocracy in power.

But the stability was the stability of the aristocracy. The sovereigns sank to a secondary place. William III., the hero of the revolution and the successor of James, was one to follow events rather than to lead them, (1688–1702.) His successors, Anne and the first and second Georges, (1702–60,) had no decided influence upon the national destinies. The rulers of England were its ministers and its Parliaments, turbid in themselves, yet the channels through which the stream was running before reaching its clearer and its wider course. The monarchy necessarily continued limited. But the church did not continue moderate, or even united. Its moderation gave way to the conservative aristocracy, the tories; its union yielded to the anti-conservative whigs. When these predominated, it was to the gain of Puritanism; when the tories got the upper hand, an extreme churchmanship prevailed.

English progress.

Yet the star of England was not going down. The very facts of an aristocracy and a Parliament imply that a larger number were sharing in the national power. A larger number also amongst the subject classes was rising to culture and to influence. The grandeur of such strains as Milton's, of such discoveries as Newton's, and the gentleness of such meditations as Addison's, of such

creations as Goldsmith's, betoken wider circles of intelligence and of elevation. After all its humiliations, the nation still stood erect, still struggled forward.

England and France.

Here lies the difference between England and France. The latter came out of her trials listless, corrupt, unbelieving. The former emerged in faith and in activity, many of her best interests broken and imperfect, but still capable of being restored, and to a higher state than they had ever reached. To England, the cycle of revolutions seemed closed for the time. To France, it seemed to be but opened. The one nation was still on the decline. The other had begun to rise.

CHAPTER II.

The Thirteen Colonies.

Old and new colonies.

We left various colonies from England scattered over the Atlantic coast. Of these, the three principal, Virginia, Massachusetts, and Maryland, were portrayed with comparative detail. Besides these three, several were mentioned as existing in New England, while others were projected in New Jersey and Carolina. It is the purpose of this chapter to show how the older colonies were concentrated, while new colonies were founded and extended.

Plymouth annexed.

The oldest colony in New England — that of Plymouth — maintained its independence for seventy years. It was then annexed to Massachusetts, (1691.)

Maine annexed.

The name of New Somersetshire was changed to Maine at the same time that Sir Ferdinando Gorges was constituted lord palatine of the province, (1639.) His deputy presently appeared to hold a general court at Saco, (1640.) The grant to Gorges covered the district from the Piscataqua to the Kennebec; but within a very few years one of the numerous patents, previously mentioned as conveying the same soil to different parties, was revived, and the land between the Kennebec and the Saco became a distinct territory, as Ligonia, (1643.) Some time later the two divisions were both annexed to Massachusetts, (1652–58,) then separated, (1665,) then reannexed, (1668,) and at length bought of the Gorges heirs by the colony of Massa-

chusetts Bay, (1677.) East of the Kennebec, as far as Pemaquid Point, there lay a tract belonging to the province of New York, (1664,) but afterwards united with Massachusetts, to which the territory beyond Pemaquid, previously occupied by one or two French posts, was also attached, (1691.) This eastern region was afterwards detached by French conquest, (1696,) but was ultimately reunited to Massachusetts by treaty with France, (1713.)

New Hampshire.

Not quite so various were the fortunes of the New Hampshire settlements. Those at Dover, Portsmouth, and Exeter,* surrendering themselves to Massachusetts, (1641–42,) left nothing but unsettled lands to bear the name of New Hampshire. But on the revival of the Mason claims to the territory east of the Merrimac, New Hampshire was declared in England to be a royal province, (1677–79.) The new government had been in operation but a short and a troubled period, when the people again united themselves to Massachusetts, (1690–92;) and, though again disunited, they were once more rejoined to that colony, at least so far as to be under one and the same governor for nearly half a century, (1698–1741.) Annexation did not prevent disturbance. New Hampshire was still the object of suits and controversies on both sides of the ocean, while the course of affairs amongst the inhabitants themselves was far from being peaceful. It finally became a separate province, (1741.)

Massachusetts.

Massachusetts Bay was the thriving sister, as we see, amongst the New England family. Her large immigrations and her increasing resources gave her the stability and the unity which her neighbors lacked. She did not go without her trials. At the very time that Plymouth and Maine were added to her domains, her independence of

* Founded by Wheelwright, one of the Hutchinson exiles, in 1638.

government was reduced by a change in her charter, (1691,) of which we shall take notice hereafter. The colony continued, however, to thrive.

Connecticut. Of the three settlements in Connecticut, two, namely, Saybrook and Connecticut, were early united under the latter name, (1644.) For this colony a royal charter was afterwards procured by John Winthrop, the early governor, (1662.) The charter included the colony of New Haven; but to this community the provisions of the instrument were so unacceptable that the union was not consummated for two years, nor would it have been so soon but for external circumstances, (1665.) While the Connecticut territory was thus rounded off, it was cut into by the grant of Long Island to the province of New York, for which, likewise, the main land was claimed as far as the Connecticut River. But this claim was repelled.

Rhode Island. The settlements of Providence and Rhode Island were united under a single charter procured by their founder, Roger Williams, from the crown, (1644.) He went a second time to England to obtain its confirmation during the commonwealth, (1651–52,) being elected president of the colony on his return, (1654.) Suspended at a later time, the charter was renewed by the royal government, (1663.) A portion of the territory supposed to be covered by the charter, and lying to the west of the Narraganset waters, was for a long period separated from the colony, under the name of the King's Province, (1665–1727.)

Four colonies in New England. Thus were the various colonies of New England reduced to four — New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut. A fifth colony, the later State of Vermont, was prepared by the Massachusetts Fort Dummer, on the site of Brattleboro', (1724,) and by the New Hampshire grants of townships, Benning-

ton being the earliest, (1749.) But the four elder colonies were all that enter into the list of the thirteen.

Virginia. Virginia, the oldest of the colonies, was still the most extensive in its limits. On the north, a bound seemed to be set by the grant of Maryland. But on the west and the south, Virginia stretched indefinitely, the grant of Carolana existing only upon paper. The government of the colony was frequently altered. Under the English commonwealth, the governors were chosen by the colonial assembly, (1652–60.) An earlier grant of the lands between the Potomac and the Rappahannoc to Lord Culpepper and his associates, (1649,) was afterwards revived, and extended to a lease of the entire colony for thirty-one years, (1673.) In vain did the Virginia assembly protest against the proceeding; in vain did it demand a charter to protect it against similar aggressions. Culpepper, buying out his associates and obtaining the appointment of governor for life, (1675,) sported his authority in England for several years before he made his appearance in Virginia, (168[illegible] His own disappointment being quite as great as the discontentment of his subjects, his authority over them was surrendered, and the provincial government was restored, (1684.) But, twenty years later, (1704,) a somewhat similar system was established by the appointment of one English nobleman after another to be governor; he, in his turn, sending out his lieutenant governor to administer the colony in his name. All the while the colony was increasing. On the south, indeed, its territories were restricted by the creation of new colonies; but on the west its settlers were crossing the mountains and clearing the farther valleys.

Maryland. The adjoining colony of Maryland underwent few territorial changes. Its vicissitudes, like those of Virginia, consisted in its passing and repassing into new hands. As Virginia changed from a province to a proprie-

tary colony, so Maryland changed from a proprietary colony to a province. After various disturbances, in none of which, however, had the proprietor's power been actually cast off, a convention of the Protestant settlers deposed the proprietary officers, (1689,) and transferred the capital of the colony from the Catholic St. Mary's to the Protestant Annapolis, (1694.) As the Protestant fervor in England was just then at its height, the proceedings of the colony were confirmed by the crown. But the head of the proprietary family in the next generation, Benedict Leonard, Lord Baltimore, becoming an English churchman, recovered the possession of Maryland, (1715.)

Carolina. The first of the new colonies amongst the thirteen was Carolina. This was the territory included first in the limits of Virginia, and then in those of Carolana by royal patent. The patentee of Carolana had made no settlement or grant; but Virginia had granted at least a portion of the territory by act of assembly, (1643.) Another portion was occupied by a Massachusetts party settled near the mouth of Cape Fear River, on land purchased from the Indians, (1660.) Without regard to any of these claims, eight persons of the highest rank, amongst them the Earl of Clarendon, then prime minister, obtained a royal patent for all the territory between Albemarle Sound and the St. John's River, (1663.) A second charter extended the northern boundary to Chowan River, and the southern to below the Spanish St. Augustine, (1665,) while a third charter annexed the Bahama Islands to the swollen province, (1667.)

North and South. It was swollen only on the map. In reality, it had but one or two shrivelled settlements. The nucleus of North Carolina was a Virginian settlement, not included in Carolina until the second charter, (1665.) The Massachusetts colony formed the nucleus of South Caro-

lina. Meeting with trials and desertions, this colony was absorbed in, rather than strengthened by, a band from Barbadoes. Other parties came from England, from New England, and from New York; with Presbyterians from Scotland and Ireland, and Huguenots from France, (1671–86.) Of the various settlements that arose, Charleston took the lead, (1680.) Both North and South Carolina were organized as proprietary governments. Such, however, were the troubles ensuing beneath these forms, that the Assembly of South Carolina, many years later, declared the proprietors to have forfeited their dominion. Following up a successful insurrection against the proprietary officials by an appeal to England, the South Carolinians obtained a provisional royal government, (1719–21.) Some time after, the crown, by act of Parliament, bought out seven of the eight proprietors, the eighth retaining his property, but not his sovereignty, (1729.) A governor was then appointed by the crown for North Carolina, both divisions being organized as royal provinces. Thenceforward, the two pursued their destinies separately.

New York. The next year after the grant of Carolina, a new grant was made in peculiar circumstances. New Netherland, though still occupied by the Dutch, was, as the province of a nation at war with England, conveyed by Charles II. to his brother James, Duke of York and Albany, as proprietor; the limits of the province being extended from the Connecticut to, and presently beyond, the Delaware, (1664.) In addition, the grant covered the eastern part of Maine and the islands to the south and west of Cape Cod, which the duke had obtained by transfer to him of early grants from the Council for New England.* These portions, however, of his domain fell at a later time

* To Sir William Alexander, afterwards Earl of Stirling, in 1621–35.

beneath the jurisdiction of Massachusetts, as has been observed; while much of the main province went to Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware. The seizure of the province from the Dutch will be told in another chapter. It continued under a proprietary form of government until the accession of the proprietor to the throne of England. It then became a royal province; though, while James II. ruled, it was more immediately dependent upon the royal authority than was customary with the provinces in general, (1685–88).

New Jersey. Hardly had the Duke of York obtained the grant of his province, when he conveyed that portion of it between the Hudson and Delaware Rivers to Sir George Carteret and Lord Berkeley, both amongst the proprietors of Carolina, (1664.) A few hamlets of Dutch and English, who had crossed from Long Island, were already sprinkled upon the territory, when the first town under the new proprietors was founded, and called Elizabethtown, (1665.) The province was named New Jersey. As in Maryland and Carolina, so in New Jersey, there soon arose dissensions between the colonists and the proprietors. The proprietors were changed. Berkeley sold out his half to certain Quakers, who made a settlement at Salem, (1675.) In the following year, a formal separation of the province took place, the settlement at Salem being situate in West, and that at Elizabethtown in East New Jersey; the latter division remaining with Carteret. A treaty with the Indians, under the auspices of the Quakers, confirmed the rights of the proprietors, (1678.) Soon after, a company, of which some, but not all, the members were Quakers, made the purchase of East New Jersey, (1682.) A large Presbyterian emigration from Scotland then took place, (1685.) But the growth of the province, as well as that of its western sister, was greatly impeded, partly by domestic disputes between

the proprietors and the settlers, and partly by contentions with the officials of New York, who pretended to continued jurisdiction over the lands which had been separated from that province. The Jerseys were finally surrendered by their proprietors to the crown, (1702.) They were then reunited as a royal province, for many years, (until 1738,) under the same governor as New York.

Pennsylvania. A Quaker, interested in both the Jerseys during the Quaker possession, obtained the grant of the adjoining territory on the west. A royal charter constituted William Penn proprietor of a district whose extent, though uncertain, might have been described in general as lying between New York, New Jersey, and Maryland. To this the name of Pennsylvania was given by the crown, (1681.) A grant from the Duke of York conveyed the territories on the lower shore of the Delaware to the same proprietor, (1682.) Of this wide domain, a variety of settlers, Dutch, Swedes, and English, were partially in occupation. To take them beneath his rule, the proprietor sent out an agent with conciliatory assurances, while, to introduce fresh bodies of inhabitants, especially of his own persuasion, he formed an association in England. The first fruits were two colonies, one led by three commissioners, in the year of the charter, (1681,) the other conducted by Penn himself in the following year, (1682.) A convention of the different settlers, new and old, presently accepted the proprietor's organization of the province, including the territories of both the royal and the ducal grants, with their previous inhabitants. Next followed a treaty with the natives, a peaceful and a feeble tribe of Indians, whose acquiescence in his plans might have been disregarded by Penn without any danger, had he not preferred to be just. The town of Philadelphia was then begun, and there the first Assembly of Pennsylvania was soon convened, (1683.) With all

Penn's care, and all his frames of government, of which there was a goodly number, the course of his proprietorship did not run smooth. Troubles within the colony were accompanied by troubles without; the province being at one time taken from him by the English authorities, (1692–94.) Even after his restoration, he found matters so difficult to manage, that he at length proposed to cede his sovereignty to the crown, (1710.) He retained it, however, and transmitted it to his sons, to be much the same source of struggle to them that it had been to him.

Delaware. The territories, so styled, of Delaware, originally a Swedish, afterwards a Dutch, possession, then an appendage of New York, and then again annexed to Pennsylvania, became so far separate from the latter province as to obtain a distinct assembly, though continuing to have the same governor, (1702.)

Georgia. Last of the thirteen was the colony of Georgia, in founding which there were mingled purposes of resistance to the Spaniards and the French in the south, as well as of relief to the suffering in England. A member of the House of Commons, James Edward Oglethorpe, had been active in proposing and carrying out an inquiry into the state of the prisons in Great Britain. The idea of rescuing some of the prisoners from a state of degradation even greater than they could have fallen into by themselves, and of settling them in a colony, occurred to Oglethorpe, as a philanthropist, while, as an officer in the royal army, he was also sensitive on the point of defending the colonial boundaries against the encroachments of other powers in America. The purchase of the Carolinas by the crown (1729) opened the way to the foundation of a colony to the south of the settlements already made; and for this a grant was obtained of the territory between the Savannah and Altamaha Rivers, under the royal name of

Georgia, (1732.) The charter conveyed the land and the dominion over it, not to colonists, nor yet to proprietors, but to twenty-one trustees, who, though subject to the royal oversight, and to the obligations of the English law, were otherwise clothed with full power for twenty-one years. A common council of thirty-four members, fifteen of whom were named in the charter, and the rest appointed by the trustees, were to act as a board of administration merely. The colonial lands, it was further provided, were to be held by feudal tenure; that is, only by male heirs. A universal interest was excited by this novel scheme of colonization. General subscriptions poured in to aid the trustees in their half-benevolent, half-patriotic plans, while Parliament made a national grant of ten thousand pounds. First to enlist personally, was a party of more than one hundred, whom Oglethorpe himself led to the settlement, which he named Savannah, (1733.) Every thing seemed to bid fair; the Indians were conciliated, the colonists were satisfied, the nation was all alive with sympathy. Immigrants came from afar; Moravians from Germany; Presbyterians from the northern mountains of Scotland; the earnest and the careless, the peasant and the prisoner, united in one people, (1734–36.) To the generous project of saving the convicts of Britain was added the devoted hope of the Moravians that the natives of America might be converted. But there was a dark side to the scene from the first. The character of the colonists, that is, of the main body from England, was helpless enough, not to say corrupted enough, to cause great difficulties both to themselves and to their trustees. It will be seen hereafter that the military service expected from the colony was pretty much a failure. The colony soon became a royal province, (1754–55.)

Such were the thirteen colonies of England. Spread out with indefinite borders and indefinite resources, they lay

Aspect of the thirteen.

like misty points along the Atlantic shore. The eye that saw them, separate and indistinct, as they rose at the beginning, could catch no vision of the broad fields and the fruitful vales that were to expand and blend together in the future. As we look back ourselves, we see few promises of development or of unity in the early days of the thirteen colonies.

CHAPTER III.

Colonial Relations.

Races. The thirteen colonies were the colonies of England. But they were far from being settled exclusively by Englishmen. The west, the centre, and the south of Europe all sent forth emigrants in greater or less numbers to people the American shore. Nor did these come to the settlements of other nations, to those of the Spaniards, the French, the Dutch, or the Swedes, alone, but rather to the English colonies, whose praise it is to have thus attracted and provided for the stranger.

Classes. As there were different races, so there were different classes. First came the gentleman, peculiarly so styled, of various look and of various spirit, according to the respective colonies, but every where classified as of "the better sort." This order was perpetuated by the law of primogeniture, the eldest son receiving at least a double, if not more than a double, share of his father's estate. Next were the people of "the poorer sort" — the lower orders, as their name denotes. But by no means the lowest; as there were others beneath them in the scale. The indented servants, or apprentices, constituted a class of temporary bondmen. Sometimes exactly what their name suggests, too young or too shiftless to be their own masters, the indented were often men of a higher grade, the adherents, in many instances, of a defeated party or of a persecuted creed, who, falling into the hands of their opponents, were

sold for transportation to a market where they could be resold at a profit. Such were the English royalists, taken captive by the parliamentary forces; such the Roman Catholics, conquered while fighting for their faith in Ireland. Such, too, were many of the exiles from the continent. So great were the numbers imported as to amount — and in time of peace — to fifteen hundred a year in the single province of Virginia. The little consideration that there was for the class appears in the colonial codes.* Lower still, however, were the slaves. The first of this class were Indians, captured in wars or taken in snares, sometimes bought of their parents, even of themselves. Then came the negroes from Africa. These poor creatures found little mercy in the colonial statutes. The English law recognizing slavery declared the children of a free father to be free. But the Virginian code declared a child to follow the lot of the mother, (1662.) The law of England pronounced it felony to kill a slave. The law of Virginia decided it to be none, (1667.)†

Of the old world.

These classes were confined to no colony, and to no division of colonies. They existed amongst the rigid settlers of the north as well as amongst the freer

* Maimed by a master, the servant is to be set free, (Mass. 1641; N. Y. 1665;) but any resistance on the servant's part entails an additional year of servitude, (Va. 1705.) Such as escape from their bonds are to be given up to their masters, or else their value is to be made up by those who harbor them, (Va. 1661.) Poorly as the class was rated, there was that about them, in their anger, which prompted the Virginians to make a "perpetual holiday" of the day on which a conspiracy, detected amongst their servants, was to have been executed, (1663.)

† The Virginia laws make it allowable to kill a fugitive, (1672,) forbid the slave at any time to carry arms, (1682,) cut him off from trial by jury, (1692,) and prohibit his manumission, except he is transported out of the province, (1692,) or except the governor and council deem him worthy of his liberty, (1724.) Other codes take much the same tone, without always entering into the same details. The most rigid laws were those of South Carolina, (1712-50.)

and easier planters of the south. But they were not of colonial creation. They came from the old world, transplanted from its ancient lands to the virgin soil of America. If they did not die, it was inevitable that they would take root and grow up with renewed luxuriance.

Institutions belong to the freemen.

The sketch that goes before shows us that the colonial institutions were not the institutions of all. They belonged to the freemen, so styled, "the better sort," with but a portion of "the poorer sort" thrown in. Indented servants and slaves, of course, had no part in the political or the social privileges of their superiors. But besides the bondmen proper, there was a large number not bondmen, and yet not freemen by the laws of the colonies. "The people," says an early writer on the Massachusetts system, "begin to complain they are ruled like slaves." Actual restlessness was showing itself. "It is feared," says the same writer, "that elections cannot be safe there long, either in church or commonwealth, so that some melancholy men think it a great deal safer to be in the midst of troubles in a settled commonwealth, or in hope easily to be settled,* than in mutinies there, so far off from succors," (1641.)

English law.

The institutions of the freemen sprang from the English law. How far this extended over the colonies was a vexed question. One class of jurists or of statesmen in England maintained that America was a conquered country, a country wrested from the native or the European races whom the English found in possession of it. The deduction from this view was, that the institutions of the country were at the pleasure of the crown or of the Parliament of England. But another class held opposite ground, asserting that the colonists were entitled, without

* Referring to the disturbances in England.

any consent or dissent on the part of England, to all the rights of Englishmen, inasmuch as the country was a discovered, not a conquered one. Some persons held an intermediate opinion, denying the notion of conquest, and yet denying the inherent claim of the colonists to English privileges, making their rights depend on actual grants from the sovereign power. So when the habeas corpus act, providing for the issue of a writ to produce the body of a prisoner, was passed, (1680,) it was said not to extend to the colonies, because they were not specially mentioned in the bill. A similar act, adopted by the Massachusetts General Court, was annulled by the crown, (1692.) But the privilege was afterwards tacitly, if not explicitly, allowed. The liberal system of interpretation slowly prevailing, the English law was almost universally recognized to be the birthright of the colonies as truly as of the mother-land.

Colonial governments.

The governments of the colonies were variously organized. Those under charters were altogether in the hands of the colonists. The charter of Massachusetts, indeed, was so far altered in 1691 as to transfer the appointment of the governor, lieutenant governor, and secretary to the crown, and even to prescribe the conditions on which the inhabitants should be admitted as freemen. The charters of Connecticut (1662) and Rhode Island (1644–63) left the entire administration to the colonists. The seven colonies originally under proprietary government — Maryland, the Carolinas, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware — were of course subject to the authority of their proprietors, but with many restrictions upon it in favor of the colonists. The Carolinas, under the model of John Locke,* and New York, under

* John Locke, the great philosopher, was employed by the Carolinian proprietors to embody their ideas — one cannot but think — rather than his own, in what was called "the grand model," or "the fundamental con-

the arbitrary rule of its ducal proprietor, who allowed no Assembly till 1683, were not so favorably situated. Pennsylvania was subjected to claims asserted nowhere else, as well as deprived of rights denied nowhere else, by two peculiarities in the charter to William Penn; one, the assertion of the power of Parliament to tax the colony, the other, the omission of the title of the colonists to the rights of Englishmen. The record that four of the proprietary governments were changed to royal governments, — the Carolinas, New York, and New Jersey, — and all at the desire of the colonists, bears witness against the institutions of which proprietors were the chiefs. The royal provinces, however, were organized on the same terms as the proprietary colonies, except that, the king being at the head of affairs, the institutions of the provinces were more uniform. The number of provinces was seven: the four just mentioned, with the older Virginia and New Hampshire and the younger Georgia.

Towns. In some of the colonies, especially those in the north, the towns were at the centre of their organisation. These were the primary bodies in which the colonists

stitutions." Of the system thus concocted, the primary element was property, the scale of colonial dignities being graduated according to the possessions of the colonist. Seigniories for the proprietors, baronies for landgraves and caciques, colonies for lords of manors, or freeholders, were the divisions of the soil. Authority was parcelled out amongst palatine and other courts for the proprietors, a grand council for them and their nobility, and a Parliament for the proprietors, the nobility, and the lords of manors. As for those not wealthy enough for either of these classes, they were hereditary tenants, or else slaves. The church of the colony was to be the church of England, with a certain amount of toleration for other creeds. This extraordinary mass of titles and of powers held together for just twenty-three years, (1669–1693,) but without ever getting into actual operation. It was relinquished by the proprietors at the universal desire of the colonists, who naturally preferred the simpler and the freer institutions originally reared under the charter.

were grouped and trained as freemen. Their workings, where they existed, are written on every page of the colonial and the national annals. Where they did not exist, their places were but poorly supplied by plantations or vestries. An instinct, as it may be called, after the establishment of towns, led the early legislators of Virginia into curious expedients. At one time, the resources of the colony were to be brought to bear on making Jamestown a city worthy of the name, (1662;) at another, each county was directed to lay out a town of its own, (1680.) At length a new capital was founded at Williamsburg, (1698.)

Assemblies. Next to the town or its substitute, under every form of government as ultimately established, there was one and the same body. This was the assembly, the same cherished institution to the colony that Parliament was to the mother land. At first, in some places, composed of all the freemen, then placed upon a representative basis, and then divided into two houses, one of councillors or assistants, the other of representatives or burgesses, the assembly exercised all the functions of a legislature, subject, of course, to the law and the sovereign of England. The House of Representatives, or of Burgesses, as the case might be in the different colonies, constituted the popular branch, so entirely in some instances as to go by the name of the assembly, leaving the councillors or assistants to appear, what they generally were, the officers of the crown. But the assembly was by no means popular, according to modern notions. A large amount of property, real or personal, was usually essential as a qualification of membership, the very voters being under some conditions of the same nature. The sessions were often few and far between; in some colonies, and at some periods, not more frequent than once in three years, or even more than three. An assembly, moreover, would sometimes hold over beyond

its lawful term, becoming as much of a burden to the colony as it was intended to be an assistance. But when once convened, at the proper season and in the proper spirit, the assembly was a tower of strength to its people.

Churches. That which was most variable, not to say most ineffective, in the colonies, was the very thing that should have been most stable and most powerful. The church of Christ was rent with factions. The blessings that might have issued from a common church, had it been pure and true, have no place in our history. The church of England was established in Virginia, Maryland, the Carolinas, and Georgia. The Quakers and the Presbyterians prevailed in the central colonies; in the northern, the Puritans carried all before them. Such divisions would not merely prevent unity; they would break up liberty.

Persecution in Massachusetts. Child. Amongst the harshest provisions of the Massachusetts system was that excluding all but church members from the rights of freemen. Against this, chiefly, was directed the petition of Dr. Robert Child, and six others, some of them of the highest station, church membership excepted, in the colony, (1646.) Child was a young man, recently arrived in the country with the purpose of making some scientific inquiry into its mineral resources. At the time of his petition, he was on the point of returning to England, but with the idea, apparently, of coming back to Massachusetts, could he be received on equal terms with the freemen of the colony. Be this as it may, he and his fellow-petitioners asked for admission to the privileges of Massachusetts, instead of which they found themselves charged with "contemptuous and seditious expressions," for which they were arraigned and heavily fined. Thus treated, they set about preparing a memorial, which Child was to convey to Parliament, and in support of which, another document, praying "for liberty

of conscience, and for a general governor" from England, was hastily got up amongst several of the non-freemen of Boston and its neighborhood. Only a few signatures to this paper were obtained, probably on account of the risk which the signers ran; one of the most active of their number being put in irons, on the discovery of the affair by the magistrates. Child himself, and some of his fellow-memorialists, were also seized; their papers were examined, and their persons detained in custody until after the ship in which they intended to take passage for England had departed. A copy of their memorial reached London, but was never acted upon.

Baptists.

"I have done too much of that work already," John Winthrop, the governor for many years, is reported to have said in his last hours, when urged to sign an order of banishment against a believer in a different church than his own, (1649.) But he left others to carry out the austerities from which the approach of death might well recall a human spirit. Within two years, John Clarke, a minister amongst the Baptist exiles of Rhode Island, was arrested while preaching in a house at Lynn, (1651.) "They more uncivilly disturbed us," said he, "than the pursuivants of the old English bishops were wont to do." Imprisoned with some of his fellow-Baptists in Boston, Clarke did not give way, but demanded the opportunity of proving, prisoner as he was, "that no servant of Jesus Christ hath any authority to restrain any fellow-servant in his worship, where no injury is offered to others." The answer of the magistrates was, "Fined twenty pounds, or to be well whipped." One of his comrades escaped with a smaller fine, but another was whipped, while two persons who showed compassion upon him were themselves arrested and fined. Clarke, after paying his fine, would have sailed to England. But not allowed even to do this, he made his

way to New Amsterdam, where he met with humaner treatment, and found the means of crossing the sea. Arrived in England, he published his "Ill News from New England," "wherein is declared, that while old England is becoming new,* New England is becoming old." "The authority there established," he says, "cannot permit men, though of never so civil, sober, and peaceable a spirit and life, freely to enjoy their understandings and consciences, nor yet to live or come among them, unless they can do as they do, and say as they say, or else say nothing; and so may a man live at Rome also," (1652.)

Salton-stall's remon-strance.

Clarke's case appears to have excited attention, notwithstanding the late indifference in relation to Child and his fellow-petitioners. Such as were opposed to the Puritans did not stand alone in condemning their intolerance. One of their own number, an early and a distinguished member of the Massachusetts Company, wrote to the elders, Wilson and Cotton, in terms of sorrowful remonstrance. "It doth not a little grieve my spirit to hear what sad things are reported daily of your tyranny and persecution in New England, as that you fine, whip, and imprison men for their consciences. . . . These rigid ways have laid you low in the hearts of the saints." Thus wrote Sir Richard Saltonstall, a Puritan, but not a persecutor, a lover of other men's liberty, as well as of his own.

Dunster of Har-vard Col-lege.

His letter was unheeded. Within a very brief period, the first president of Harvard College, Henry Dunster, a clergyman, a scholar, and a true man, was tried, convicted, and obliged to resign his office, on the charge of being a Baptist, (1654.) "The whole transaction of this business," wrote he, "is

* In the time of the commonwealth.

such, which in process of time, when all things come to mature consideration, may very probably create grief on all sides; yours subsequent, as mine antecedent. I am not the man you take me to be." In the following year, (1655,) the corporation of the college appealed to the General Court to pay the amount still due to the deposed president, as well as to allow him something additional, "in consideration of his extraordinary pains." But so intemperate was the disposition of the authorities, as to refuse not only the additional grant, but even the actual balance of the president's account. The spirit of wisdom had not yet descended either upon Harvard College or upon the community by which it had been founded.

Quakers. A new class of victims appeared. A few unhappy Quakers — the more unhappy, if guilty of the fanatical excesses with which they were charged — came to Boston, some of them to brave, all of them to encounter, persecution, (1656.) Brought immediately before the magistrates, they were first confined, and then sent away beyond the limits of the colony. Laws were at once passed, inflicting a fine of one hundred pounds upon any master of a vessel who brought a Quaker with him, and ordering imprisonment and scourging for any Quaker that might appear. This not being deemed enough, a new batch of statutes was prepared within the next two years, (1657–58,) fining the spectator or the worshipper at a Quaker meeting, the host of a Quaker, and threatening the Quaker himself with loss of ears, mutilation of tongue, and, finally, if he returned after being banished, with death. In these horrible enactments, almost all New England, except Rhode Island, coincided. They did not remain dead letters. One of the oldest freemen of the colony, Nicholas Upsall, accused merely of kindness to the persecuted, was banished for three years, and, on his return, was thrown into a two-

years' imprisonment, (1656–59.) Nor was this the only case of the kind. As for the persecuted themselves, they were fined, imprisoned, scourged, and at length hanged, (1659–60.) Had it not been for the royal commands that these outrages should cease, (1660,) there is no saying how far they might have been carried. As it was, the persecution continued at intervals, until a fresh order came from the king, requiring liberty of faith for all Protestants, (1679.)

Witches.

The saddest deeds of oppression in Massachusetts are yet to be told. It is accountable that the Puritan authorities should be bitter upon those who opposed their institutions or their creeds. But that they should raise a hue and cry against those who had no thought of opposing them, those against whom no charge could be substantiated but that of feebleness, of age, or of deformity, seems inexplicable. An English law of older date than any existing English colony, (1603,) by which witchcraft was declared a capital crime, found a place amongst the so-called liberties of Massachusetts, (1641.) Some years elapsed before it was enforced, (1656;) nor did it then seem to set so well upon the consciences of the rulers as to make them desirous of keeping it in operation. A later attempt at the same sort of thing in Pennsylvania resulted in the acquittal of the unfortunate object of ill will, (1684.) When all was quiet, and the troubles of witchcraft appeared to have subsided forever, there was a sudden swell. A witch, so styled and so condemned, was executed at Boston, (1688.) One victim not being enough, others were soon demanded, and found at Salem village, now Danvers. The magistrates of the colony had thrown a hundred persons into prison, when the governor, Sir William Phips, arrived from England to head the persecution. The lieutenant governor, William Stoughton, presided at the judicial tribunals.

Behind these official personages, several of the elders or ministers, led by Increase and Cotton Mather, father and son, urged on the ferocious pursuit. It lasted eight long months, devouring twenty victims, torturing many others, and threatening a still larger number, when the work of blood was arrested, partly by interference from England, and partly by accusations directed against some of the persecutors themselves, (1693.) "The Lord be merciful to the country," exclaimed Chief Justice Stoughton, on finding that he could sentence no more as guilty of witchcraft. Years later, the letters of Robert Calef, a merchant of Boston, who wrote against the fierce delusion of his neighbors, were burned in the yard of Harvard College by order of the president, Increase Mather, (1700.)

Persecution elsewhere.

We have lingered long in Massachusetts. It is there that we find the most striking traces of that persecuting spirit of which almost every colony had its share. New England, with one exception, occupied the same ground as its principal colony. New York ordered every Roman Catholic priest voluntarily entering the province to be hanged, (1700.) Protestants were likewise visited with penalties or with restrictions, unless they submitted to the church of England, (1704.) Maryland began by an act which proclaimed death to all who denied the Trinity, and fine, scourging, imprisonment, and banishment, to all who denied "the blessed Virgin Mary or the holy apostles or evangelists," (1649.) Long after, the Roman Catholics becoming, as has been mentioned, the objects of persecution, their public services were forbidden, and their offices as teachers, both private and public, were suspended, (1704.) Of all the colonies, however, none kept nearer to Massachusetts in the race of persecution than Virginia, the colony of the English, as Massachusetts was that of the Puritan church. A few Puritans, who had found a corner

in Virginia, invited some ministers from Massachusetts and New Haven. Three came, but were almost immediately warned by the government "to depart the colony with all conveniency," (1642–43.) Another Puritan clergyman, with many of his persuasion, was banished a few years later, (1648–49.) The Puritans being disposed of, the Quakers came in for attention. A law inflicted a hundred pounds' fine upon the shipmaster who introduced, and upon the colonist who entertained, a Quaker, the Quaker himself being imprisoned until he gave security that he would leave the colony never to return, (1660–63.) Baptists were provided for in another law, subjecting them to a fine, (1662.) Thus the prey upon which the Puritan magistrates pounced in the north was assailed by the church of England authorities in the south. The same spirit, suspicious and oppressive, was at work throughout the land.

Save in Rhode Island.

Save in one nook, where liberality and confidence prevailed. In Rhode Island, the colony whose people were twofold exiles, — exiles from England, and exiles from New England, — persecution found no place. The assembly, gathered under the charter of 1644, established freedom of faith by legislative enactment, (1647.) In petitioning for the charter of 1663, the Rhode Islanders urged their "lively experiment that a most flourishing civil state may stand and best be maintained with a full liberty of religious concernments." Time and maturing wisdom had taught Roger Williams to practise what he preached in favor of liberty of conscience. Even the Quakers, whose doctrines he much disliked and opposed, found refuge amongst his people, and so securely, that Rhode Island refused to insist upon the oath of allegiance to the crown, on account of the Quaker scruples to taking oaths of any kind. "The first liberty," wrote Williams, "is of

our spirits, which neither Old nor New England knows the like, nor no part of the world a greater." He died, (1683;) but so directly did his better spirit descend to those coming after him, that with one exception bearing upon Roman Catholics, then excluded from the privileges of all the colonies, the laws of Rhode Island continued to bear and to forbear for generation after generation.

Inter-colonial difficulties.

The relations between one class and another within the colony being such as have been described, it may be inferred how uncertain were the relations between colony and colony. Differences of origin and of situation, enhanced by differences of creed, of policy, and of interest, brought about divisions and hostilities. Nor were these confined to colonies that were far remote from one another in position or in character. On the contrary, the instances to be mentioned are those of quarrels among neighbors; nay, even among allies.

Shawomet and Massachusetts.

Samuel Gorton, a clothier from London, who found no welcome in Boston, Plymouth, or even in the Rhode Island settlements, purchased, in the last-named vicinity, some land from the Indians, and began the little colony of Shawomet. He seems to have been a sort of spiritualist, much given to rhapsody, if not blasphemy, but harmless, disposed to force his views upon none, and ready to fly rather than to fight amidst the warring parties of New England. But when pursued by his old opponents of Massachusetts, on the ground that the land which his colony occupied was theirs by virtue of subsequent negotiations with the Indians, Gorton resolved to make a stand, (1643.) It was in vain. The dozen men whom he had with him could make no effectual defence against the forty who came, with commissioners at their head, from Massachusetts. A few of the Shawomet party escaped; but Gorton, with nine others, was transported as a

captive to Boston. There he was put upon trial, partly for rejecting the dominion, and partly for rejecting the creed of his conquerors. Convicted, of course, he was set to work in irons, most of his companions meeting the same fate. But as they proved troublesome, especially by instilling their doctrines into those around them, they were set free, "no more to come into the colony, upon pain of death," (1644.) Gorton at once repaired to England, where, from the Earl of Warwick, then "governor-in-chief and lord high admiral of all those islands and plantations within the bounds and upon the coasts of America," he obtained a patent for his colony as a part of the Providence Plantations, the name of Shawomet being changed to that of its protector — Warwick, (1647.) Not long after, Massachusetts attempted to get up another onslaught upon the Warwick settlement, but was prevented, (1651.)

United colonies of New England.

Massachusetts was at the head of a confederacy, the story of which will be found to throw much light upon the relations of colony to colony. It had been proposed, at an early date, (1637,) to form a league amongst the New England settlements; but the project fell through, on account of the resistance of Connecticut to the demands of Massachusetts. Circumstances induced Connecticut to give way, some time afterwards, when a confederacy was formed, under the name of "The United Colonies of New England," (1643.) Each colony was to appoint two commissioners, who must be church members, to conduct all matters of administration, to decide upon questions of peace or war, to regulate the demand and surrender of fugitive servants, slaves, or criminals; but all acts of the commissioners required ratification by the people. In case of war, a certain number of troops was to be furnished by the different members of the league. Massachusetts, furnishing a double proportion, obtained the honor

of having the commissioners' annual session held twice as often at Boston as at any other place of meeting. Indeed, Massachusetts was the head and front of the whole confederacy.

Treatment of Rhode Island.

The spirit of the league soon came out. Massasetts, (then including New Hampshire,) Plymouth, and the two Connecticut colonies, being united, there remained Maine and Rhode Island. Maine was too scantily settled, as well as too remotely situated, to be taken into account; but Rhode Island, begirt by the confederates, had some claims to consideration. At all events, it asked admission to the union. The demand was refused, except on condition that the colony would submit itself as a dependent to Plymouth. One cannot but wonder that, with such a temper, the league refrained from blotting its independent neighbor out of existence.

Disagreements.

Things went by no means smoothly amongst the confederates themselves. At one time, Connecticut imposed a tax on river navigation, which acted adversely to the interests of the town of Springfield, (1647.) Massachusetts, at first remonstrating, soon broke out with an impost upon goods imported from the other three colonies of the league, (1649.) Nor was this repealed until after a grave protest from the commissioners, (1650.) A year or two later, Connecticut desired war to be declared against the Dutch and Indians. Perhaps it was a hasty project; but it found support from Plymouth. Massachusetts, however, refused to enter into it, and by so doing, nearly broke up the confederacy, (1653.) When the confederates agreed, it was often about such measures as those of persecution, to which reference has been made, or those of warfare, to which we shall arrive ere long. In fact, the United Colonies were united chiefly in deeds of violence. In works of justice or of generosity, they generally broke asunder. When

their union came to an end, after a feeble existence of half a century, it was regretted by none.

Dissensions elsewhere.

The New England colonies were not alone in these disturbed relations. New York was long at variance with Connecticut on one side, and with New Jersey on the other. Pennsylvania had her complaints against Virginia; Delaware hers against Pennsylvania. Wherever there was a view from one colony to another, it seemed to open as frequently upon scenes of controversy as upon those of peace.

Penn and Baltimore.

Leaving the colonies themselves, and turning to their proprietors, where they had any, we discover the same disposition to strife. When William Penn obtained the grant of his domain of Pennsylvania, he knew that it encroached upon the claims of the Baltimore family of Maryland. Their title to the territory, as far north as the fortieth degree of latitude, had been infringed upon, but by foreigners — by the Dutch and by the Swedes. It was reserved for a fellow-countryman to appropriate it to himself. Soon after the arrival of Penn in America, he met Lord Baltimore at Newcastle, but without being able to come to any agreement. This did not prevent the Quaker from founding his City of Brotherly Love upon the land claimed by the rival proprietor, (1682.) At another meeting, in the following year, Penn consented to recognize the Baltimore claim, but only on condition that a price should be fixed for a portion bordering upon the Delaware, of which he naturally wished to retain the sovereignty. But as this offer was refused, while another mode of settlement, proposed by Baltimore, was refused in turn by Penn, the two proprietors again separated in anger. When Baltimore renewed his demands, a few months after, Penn threw himself upon the Dutch title, to which he claimed succession through the Duke of York, (1683.) After such a plea

as this, there was no hope of justice from Penn. Appeal was made to England, where sentence was rendered against Baltimore, without being actually executed, (1685.) It was three quarters of a century before the boundary between Pennsylvania and Maryland was definitely determined.

Relations to the mother country.

The relations of the colonies to the mother country, that is, to England, so far as they depended upon general principles, were brought forward in an earlier part of the chapter. It is time to take them up with reference to the actual course of events.

The crown.

Allegiance to the crown was one of the inborn principles of the English colonist. It extended from him to those who had come from other lands than England. The King of England was the head of the church and the head of the state — the supreme civil and military power, to whom all the magistrates, all the tribunals, all the laws, all the proceedings of the colonies, were subject. Even in the charter governments, the most independent of all, the royal supremacy was universally recognized. At the same time, the exact limits between the sovereignty of the king and the independence of the colony were nowhere defined. In the royal provinces, where the dependence upon the crown was the greatest, the rights of the popular bodies were often most pertinaciously asserted.

Charles II. and Massachusetts.

As striking an exhibition as any other of the relations of the colonies with royalty is to be found in the twenty-five years' controversy between Charles II. and Massachusetts. When the restoration of that monarch occurred, nearly a year was allowed to elapse, after the certain intelligence of the event, without any proclamation of the royal authority in Massachusetts. There was a good deal, in fact, for the colony to do, in order to make the proclamation satisfactory to all concerned. In the

first place, she had to renounce all such theories as John Eliot had propounded in his Christian Commonwealth, concerning the superiority of the Mosaic over the English institutions. In the next place, she had "to reject, as an infringement of right, any parliamentary or royal imposition prejudicial to the country." So that, between her own republicans on the one side, and the monarchists of England on the other, there was some difficulty in steering a course. At length, the king being proclaimed, John Norton and Simon Bradstreet were sent as agents, with letters and instructions half servile and half defiant, to seek the royal presence and obtain a confirmation of the colonial institutions, (1662.) The king confirmed the charter, but added requisitions that were likely to set the whole colony in an uproar. All laws, he said, against the royal authority, must be repealed; the oath of allegiance to the crown must be exacted; the Book of Common Prayer must be tolerated, and the sacraments administered to "all of honest lives;" nay, the freeholders of the colony, if of suitable estate and character, must be admitted as its freemen. Such was the spite of Massachusetts men, in relation to the royal demands, even against their own helpless agents, that the minister Norton sank, it is said, under the general displeasure, (1663.) The arrival of four royal commissioners, in the following year, was followed by a celebration of the church service, and by a law from the assembly, declaring freeholders, on certain conditions, to be freemen, (1664.) The next proceedings of the commissioners resulted in the temporary toleration of churchmen and Quakers, (1665.) It must have seemed as if the very foundations of Massachusetts had been thrown down.

Long years of controversy between the colony and the king ensued. The departure of the commissioners was followed by the almost immediate arrest of the changes

Loss of the Massachusetts and other charters.

which they had introduced. A summons from the king, calling upon the colony to send representatives to answer the charges against it, was disobeyed, (1666.) Yet five years were allowed to elapse before the contumacy of the Massachusetts people was noticed, and then they were virtually passed over as "almost on the brink of renouncing any dependence on the crown," (1671.) Quite a considerable interval succeeded, in which agents after agents upheld the colony against its adversaries in England. Even bribes were resorted to, the Province of Maine and two thousand guineas being offered to the king himself. But it was too late. The royal will was roused; the warrant went forth that the colony must submit, if it would have any charter at all. The magistrates were for yielding; the representatives — that is, the mass of the colonists — were for resisting; and while they clung to their charter, it was declared to be forfeited, (1684.) The king immediately appointed a governor for Massachusetts, Plymouth, Maine, and New Hampshire; but Charles dying, another official was sent out by James II., bearing the title of president of the same colonies, with the addition of the King's Province in Rhode Island, (1685.) The same year, the Rhode Island and Connecticut charters were put in abeyance.

Parliament.

Next to the crown was the Parliament of the mother country. But this was by no means so fully acknowledged in the colonies. "We have not admitted appeals to your authority," says the Massachusetts General Court to Parliament, "being assured they cannot stand with the liberty and power granted us by our charter," (1646,) — a declaration which was followed up by Edward Winslow, then the agent for Massachusetts in England. "If the Parliament of England," he says, "should impose laws upon us, having no burgesses in the

House of Commons nor capable of a summons by reason of the vast distance, we should lose the liberties and freedom of Englishmen indeed." It was on these very grounds that the sway claimed for Parliament was again and again resisted. It was, however, again and again obeyed.

Navigation acts.

Parliament asserted its powers at an early day. During the commonwealth, when it ruled supreme over England, it stretched forth its sceptre over America by an act requiring all colonial exports to England to be shipped only in American or English vessels, (1651.) This was extended by Parliament and the crown together, after the restoration of royalty, in a second act, ordering that most of the exports from the colonies should be shipped only to England, or to an English colony, and in American or English vessels, as before, (1660.) Two or three years afterwards, it was enacted that almost all imports into the colonies should be shipped only from England or from an English colony, and in American or English vessels, as by the preceding statutes, (1663.) These were the famous navigation acts, the first assertions of parliamentary authority over the commerce of the colonies. How grievous to these such restrictions were needs not to be dwelt upon.

Duties.

They were followed up, at no long interval, by duties upon the export and import of certain "enumerated articles" from one colony to another, (1672.) This was interfering, not only with the trade, but with the very constitution of the colonies. It required a new body of officials in the shape of revenue officers, appointed, of course, by the crown. Royal custom houses were also needed. It was soon proposed to demand an oath from the governors of New England — where trade was busiest, and discontent rifest — that they would enforce the commercial restrictions. But John Leverett, governor of Massachusetts, refused, and the General Court of the same colony soon passed a

resolution "that the acts of navigation are an invasion of the rights and privileges of the subjects of his majesty in this colony, they not being represented in the Parliament," (1676–79.) A notice of the appointment of a collector of the royal customs for New England was torn down in Boston by order of the colonial magistrates, (1680.) But it was in vain, as we shall soon find. Parliament had adopted the principle of regulating the colonial trade, and was not likely to yield to the ebullitions of Boston, or of any other place in the colonies.

Royal governors.

The authority of the mother country, whether royal or parliamentary, was represented by a constantly increasing number of officials in the colonies. Of these none were so prominent as the royal governors, to whom we now arrive in pursuing the account of the colonial relations.

Berkeley in Virginia.

Nowhere did things go worse than in Virginia, of which Sir William Berkeley, a loyal cavalier, had been governor for more than twenty years.* Under his influence, the very assembly of the province became a burden, protracting its sessions and extending its prerogatives, providing a perpetual (so termed) instead of an annual revenue for the royal officials, and appointing county courts to levy certain imposts which were within its own province alone. To these difficulties were added others arising from the hostile bearing of the Indians, with whom the governor was disposed to temporize far more than suited the ardent Virginians, (1676.)

Bacon's rebellion.

All at once, the province rose. One of the council, Nathaniel Bacon, being refused a commission against the Indians, declared that he would take out a commission of his own; at which the governor unseated him

* From 1641 to 1652, and again from 1660.

and declared him a rebel. But he was not the only one to be put down. William Drummond, the first governor of North Carolina, and Richard Lawrence, both men of energy and of culture, came out at Jamestown on Bacon's side. At their demand, supported by other colonists of influence, the assembly by which the governor had been blindly supported was dissolved. Bacon, elected to a new assembly, carried various measures of reform, besides obtaining a commission of commanding officer against the Indians. Again declared a rebel, he called a convention, who promised to stand by him while he proceeded against the foe upon the frontier. But on the governor's taking the field with armed servants and Indians, supported by some English men-of-war, Bacon and his party returned to meet him. Berkeley retreated, Bacon fired Jamestown, and soon after died. The cause which he had staked his all to support soon fell to pieces, and his chief adherents, Drummond amongst them, were hanged. Lawrence disappeared. "That old fool," said the good natured Charles II., on hearing of his governor's revenge, "has hanged more men in that naked colony than I did here for the murder of my father." Berkeley died of shame, it is said, in England. He left Virginia crushed and desolate.

Andros in New England.

New England, consolidated into one province, was given over to Sir Edmund Andros, formerly governor of New York, (1686.) He made his appearance with troops, overthrowing the colonial assemblies, if there were any left to overthrow, declaring the town organizations at an end, prohibiting the printing press, and threatening even the property of the colonists by requiring them to take out new deeds of their estates from him. It was a part of his commission to procure toleration, especially for the church of England. To do this in Boston, he saw fit to seize upon one of the Puritan churches to celebrate

the church service. Resistance was not attempted, and Andros and his council ruled supreme; nor only over New England, but likewise over New York and New Jersey, both of which were attached to his government, (1688.) In fact, he was on the high road to dominion over all the colonies. The charters of the Carolinas and of Maryland — that is, of every other colony which had a charter, save Pennsylvania alone — were menaced, (1686–88.) A waste of despotism seemed to be opening wherever freedom had found a foothold.

Revolution. Just then came the news of the revolution in England, (1689.) It was welcomed by a revolution in America. Boston rose against Andros, deposing him, and declaring Simon Bradstreet governor. The reaction was by no means gentle. The churchmen, whom Andros had favored, and who supported him, sent an address to King William, bewailing the peril to them from the returning "anarchy and confusion of government under which this country hath so long groaned." Rhode Island and Connecticut went farther than Massachusetts, and resumed their treasured charters. New York took up arms under Jacob Leisler and a committee of safety. The other colonies, less sorely oppressed than those of New England and New York, received the news in comparative tranquillity. A party in Maryland rose, but not against oppression so much as for the sake of sedition. The proprietary government fell, as has been told.

But not liberty. It soon appeared, however, that the English revolution was not intended to be interpreted as setting the colonies free. The charter of 1691 proved it in Massachusetts. The execution of Jacob Leisler and his son-in-law, Milbourne, in New York, by orders, however, of the new governor, Colonel Sloughter, rather than by those of the king, was equally conclusive, (1691.)

The appointment of Andros — the same Sir Edmund who had trampled upon both Massachusetts and New York — to the government of Virginia* was a still more stunning demonstration, (1692.)

Fletcher in New York.

A new attempt at colonial consolidation soon occurred. Colonel Benjamin Fletcher, a man of far less character than Andros, was made governor of New York and Pennsylvania, including Delaware; the proprietary government in the latter colonies being then suspended, (1692.) He was also declared commander-in-chief of the Connecticut and the New Jersey militia. Soon after taking possession of New York and Pennsylvania, Fletcher proceeded to Connecticut to take command of the militia. They assembled at his orders; but instead of listening to his commission, the senior officer, Captain Wadsworth, cried, "Beat the drums!" On Fletcher's attempting to persevere, Wadsworth exclaimed, "If I am interrupted again, I'll make the sun shine through you in a moment," (1693.) Thus baffled in his military functions, the governor returned to his civil powers in New York and Pennsylvania. The latter province, after resisting his demands for a grant of money, yielded only on condition that it should be disbursed by the provincial treasurer — a condition which Fletcher would not, and, if obedient to his instructions, could not allow, (1694.) New York itself was restive under his control. A tax for the support of ministers and the erection of churches had led to a debate between the council and the assembly; the council proposing that the governor should nominate the new clergy, but the assembly opposing. "You take it upon you," declared Fletcher to the assembly, "as if you were dictators;" but the assem

* He proved, however, to be a comparatively good governor there

bly stood fast, and soon carried their point, "that the vestry and the churchwardens have a power to call their own minister," a dissenter, if so they pleased, although the governor was strong for the church of England, (1695.) It had been proposed by a clergyman of this church to combine New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Rhode Island in a single province, with a bishop, residing at New York, for its civil as well as ecclesiastical head. But this, more naturally even than Governor Fletcher's designs, came to nought. Fletcher himself, falling into disgrace at home, was recalled, leaving his attempts at consolidation an utter failure, (1698.)

General strictness.

The troubles implied in the various colonial relations account for much that has been ascribed to other causes. It has been so common to consider the Puritan severity as a thing apart, that one does not immediately seize upon the fact of the almost universal strictness that prevailed. Virginia, for instance, gave no harbor to Puritanism. Yet the Virginia code thunders against "mercenary attorneys," (1643,) burgesses "disguised with over much drink," (1659,) tippling houses, (1676,) and Sunday travelling, (1692.) Maryland declares with as much solemnity as Massachusetts against profanity, (1642.) Nor were precautions of a different nature neglected. Both Maryland (1642–1715) and New York (1665) make it necessary to procure a passport before traversing or leaving the colonial precincts. It was from a similar impulse that the "handicraftsmen" of Boston petitioned the General Court of Massachusetts to be protected against "strangers from all parts" who were interfering with their trade, not to say their influence in the community, (1677.) All over the colonies, there reigned a spirit of watchfulness, perhaps more grim, but certainly not more resolute, in one place than in another.

It might be increased or diminished by the social or the religious temper of the colonists; the New Englander was likely to be more upon his guard than the Virginian. But the spirit was the common growth of the new country, whose depths were still hid in the wilderness, whose borders were still bristling with the arrow or the steel.

Perils of the frontier.

The perils of the frontier are yet to be described. All around the colonists, there extended a line, or rather a series of lines, one after another, of suspected neighbors or of open foes. The Indian lay in ambush on this side; on that, the European, Swede, Dutchman, Spaniard, or Frenchman, stood in threatening attitude. Nor was the land alone overspread with enemies; the waters swarmed with pirates and with buccaneers; nay, the very air seemed to be filled with ghostly shapes and with appalling sounds. The world of spirits, as the colonists believed, was agitated by the wars amongst the races of America.

CHAPTER IV.

Indian Wars.

Spirit of the Indians.

It is not always that justice is done to the spirit of the Indians. They are pitied when they are not vilified. Yet there are few passages in human history more indicative of native nobleness in man than those which bring before us the trustful and the generous dealings of the red men with the early adventurers to their shores. "Welcome, Englishmen," cried the sagamore Samoset to the Plymouth settlers, in words caught from English fishermen. The greater sachem Massasoit pledged his friendship to the same colony by a formal treaty, (1621.) When the tribe of Powhatan complained of the strangers in Virginia, their chief replied, "They do but take a little waste land." Even when the anger of Powhatan was kindled, and so strongly as to lead him to plan the destruction of the English, beginning with their leader, John Smith, whom he had taken captive, there was still the maiden Pocahontas to plead for mercy and for peace, (1607.)

Spirit of the English.

The spirit of the English was generally very different. Their wrath was ever easy to be inflamed, ever difficult to be quenched. To most of them the natives were outcasts, "of the cursed race of Ham," fit to be deluded, insnared, enslaved, or exterminated. But this was not the spirit of all. There were some to be touched by the original confidence of the Indians, some to repay it by trust and by charity. "Concerning the killing

of those poor Indians," wrote John Robinson, the Puritan minister, from Holland to his brethren at Plymouth, in relation to the slaughter of several natives suspected of conspiring against that settlement — "O, how happy a thing had it been, if you had converted some, before you had killed any. Besides, where blood is once begun to be shed, it is seldom stanched of a long time after. . . . It is also a thing more glorious in men's eyes than pleasing in God's, or convenient for Christians, to be a terror to poor barbarous people," (1623.)

Missionary labors.

It was the idea of King James of England, in issuing the patent of Virginia, to civilize and convert the natives of the country which he was giving to his companies. The London Company, accordingly, in conjunction with individuals both in England and in America, made some exertion to carry out the royal design. A school for natives was planned, as has been mentioned, but without being established. The colony of Plymouth, listening to Robinson's appeal, recognized the possibility of brotherhood with the Indians. Laws were formally enacted to provide for the conversion of the natives to the Christian faith, (1636.) Elsewhere, likewise, the same views found advocates; and more than one colonist became the friend, the teacher, nay, the martyr to the Indians.

The Mayhews and Eliot.

Obtaining an English grant of Martha's Vineyard, and then confirming his title by purchase from the natives, Thomas Mayhew began almost immediately to teach those who remained with him upon the island, (1643.) A more active missionary, however, was his son Thomas, who, after ten years' exertions, perished on a voyage to England, whither he was going for aid to his mission, (1657.) His father, and afterwards his son, continued the work to which he had sacrificed himself. Meanwhile John Eliot had begun his labors on the Massa-

chusetts mainland. Preparing himself by the study of the Indian tongue, of which he afterwards composed a grammar, he met a party of Indians, for the first time as their preacher, at Nonantum. "Upon October 28, 1646," he writes with touching simplicity, "four of us (having sought God) went unto the Indians inhabiting our bounds, with desire to make known the things of their peace to them." Thenceforward Eliot went on founding and rearing Indian churches, now travelling from the Merrimac to Cape Cod, and now laboring at the translation of the Catechism, and even of the Bible, into the language of his converts, (1661–63.)

Supports. Both Eliot and the Mayhews, as well as other missionaries to the Indians, received their chief encouragement from a Society "for Promoting and Propagating the Gospel of Jesus Christ in New England," incorporated by act of Parliament, (1649.) Large collections aided the labors and provided for the expenses of those who engaged in the holy enterprise. "Right honorable nursing fathers," is the address which Eliot uses in giving the society an account of his labors. He writes to Robert Boyle, apparently the life and soul of the society, as his "right honorable, right charitable, and indefatigable nursing father." New England itself did comparatively little. Massachusetts granted lands to the converted Indians, but without much sympathy with them or with their teachers. The work, as a colonial one, languished.

Results. The results were therefore inconsiderable. What the Indians, or many of them, thought of the missions may be gathered from the answer of a Narraganset sachem to the missionary Mayhew applying for permission to preach among the tribe. "Go make the English good first." What many of the English thought of the missions may be gathered from the declaration of Daniel Gookin,

superintendent of the converts, — "a pillar," says Eliot, "in our Indian work," — that he was "afraid to be seen in the streets," at the time of much ill will against the natives. Thirty years after the missionary enterprise began, there were nominally upwards of three thousand converts, (1673.) But the first church which Eliot founded — that at Natick — was, a few years subsequent to his death, but "a small church of seven men and three women; their pastor, Daniel Tohkohwampait," (1698.) Even before Eliot departed, he had seen his work declining. Endeavoring to get out a new edition of his version of the Scriptures, he wrote, "I am deep in years, and sundry say, if I do not procure it printed while I live, it is not within the prospect of human reason whether ever, or when, or how it may be accomplished." Things must have been low indeed, when the mere reprint of the Bible was so difficult. But "his charity," to use Eliot's deathbed words, "held out still," and all that he could do was done when he died, (1690.)

Wars in Virginia and Maryland.

The wars with the Indians were more effective. Earliest of these was the war of Opechancanough, Powhatan's successor, against the colony of Virginia. Provoked by the murder of one of their warriors, the Indians suddenly fell upon the English settlements, which, it seems, they would have utterly annihilated, but for the warning given by a converted countryman of theirs to a Jamestown settler, (1622.) Hostilities, continued at intervals for many years, were revived by a second surprise of the colony by the Indians, (1642.) Opechancanough being taken prisoner and slain, his confederates made peace, giving up all the land between the York and James Rivers, (1646.) In this latter war, Maryland had been involved. Thirty years later, the two colonies were again united in repelling the Susquehannas, with some other tribes, (1675–77.)

Pequot war. Meanwhile, more dangerous conflicts had arisen in New England. The first actual war with the Indians there occurred in consequence of some murders by the Pequots and the Narragansets; the latter tribe extending along the western shore of Narraganset Bay, the former stretching from the Thames to the Connecticut Rivers. The Narraganset chief, Canonicus, making amends for his followers, the expedition which Massachusetts equipped to avenge the murdered was directed chiefly against the Pequots, with the result, however, of exciting rather than punishing them, (1636.) They were on the point of persuading the Narragansets to make common cause with them, when Roger Williams, at the peril of his life, sought the wigwam of Canonicus, in order to avert an alliance which would have threatened Massachusetts, not to say New England, with desolation. It was the return which the exile made for the persecution from which he had but just escaped. Instead of joining the Pequots, the Narragansets sent their young sachem Miantonimoh to make friends with the people at Boston. At about the same time, the alliance of the Mohegans, a tribe of Northern Connecticut, under Uncas, was secured by the Connecticut colonists. As the spring opened, the colonial forces, amounting in all to little more than one hundred, with two or three hundred Indian allies, took the field, and in four months swept the unhappy Pequots from the face of the earth. Nearly a thousand of them were slain; the rest, whether men or women, old or young, being reduced to captivity and slavery. Their territory was divided between Massachusetts and Connecticut, (1637.)

Narragansets. Notwithstanding the alliance with Miantonimoh and the Narragansets, they were soon treated as foes. Defeated by the Mohegans, with whom they went to war, the Narragansets saw their chieftain a prisoner. He

was saved by the interposition of his friend Gorton, the founder of Warwick, only to be given up again by the commissioners of the United Colonies to the Mohegan Uncas, by whom he was immediately despatched. To shield Uncas from the revenge of the Narraganseets, the colonies furnished him with a body guard, and even took up arms, when Pessacus, the brother and successor of Miantonimoh, began war against his Mohegan enemies. Nor did Pessacus avert the storm thus conjured up, but by submitting to make amends to both the Mohegans and the United Colonies, (1645.) The tribute which he then consented to pay was afterwards wrenched from him by violence, (1650.)

King Philip.

A quarter of a century later, and the ill-treated tribe of Miantonimoh and Pessacus were drawn into the great war that goes by the name of King Philip's. He was Pometacum, the nephew and successor of Massasoit, with whom the Plymouth colonists had made an early treaty, the chief of the Pokanokets or Wampanoags, a tribe on the eastern shore of Narraganset Bay. Suspected and assailed by the people of Plymouth, whose authorities claimed jurisdiction over him, Philip (to call him by his familiar name) was at length accused of hatching a general conspiracy amongst the Indians. The accuser, a native of bad character, although professedly converted, was slain by some of Philip's men, three of whom were presently hanged, without any actual proof of their being the murderers, by orders of the court at Plymouth. Philip wept, it is said, at the idea of warfare with the English. But he could not keep peace with them; and so began a war, by far the most deadly of all between the English and the Indians, (1675.)

Driven almost immediately from his domains about Mount Hope, and soon afterwards from his retreats in

War throughout New England.

the Rhode Island swamps, Philip led his few warriors into the heart of Massachusetts, where the Indians had already risen in arms. Thence the circle of hostilities spread on all sides, to the tribes of the Connecticut valley in the west, to those of the Merrimac valley in the east, and farther still, to the Abenakis of Maine — the latter, however, being engaged in warfare of their own, unconnected with Philip and his allies. Against these was arrayed the whole of New England. Rhode Island, it is true, rather suffered than fought; nor were Maine and New Hampshire, then the dependencies of Massachusetts, able to take any active part. But the United Colonies were all in arms. A few hundred combatants were the most that could be mustered in any single battle; yet the strife was more than proportioned to the numbers or the resources on either side. Month after month witnessed scenes of ambush, assault, devastation, and butchery. The work of blood was as savagely done by the English as by the Indians.

Destruction of the Narragansets.

As winter drew nigh, the suspicions of the colonies were excited by Uncas, the Mohegan, against his old foes, the Narragansets. They had given pledges of peace at the beginning of the war; nor were there now any signs of hostility on their part, except the shelter which they were charged with giving to the broken Pokanokets. But the commissioners of the United Colonies, the successors of those who had given up Miantonimoh and humbled Pessacus, declared war against the Narragansets and their chief, Canonchet. It took but a few days to overrun the Narraganset territory, and to defeat the tribe in a fearful fight which cost the colonial forces dear. Driven from their forests and their fastnesses, the Narragansets spread over the adjoining lands, and even as far as within eighteen miles of Boston. "We will die to

the last man," exclaimed Canonchet, when taken in the spring, "but not be slaves to the Englishman." He was slain, and his nation laid low forever.

Of Philip. The fall of the Narragansets was accompanied by that of the tribes within the limits of Massachusetts. Most of the survivors turned their backs upon their ancient hunting grounds in search of freedom in the north and west. Philip, who had mourned over the beginning of the war, was too strong in heart to outlive its close. He sought the home of his fathers, and there, after losing his wife, his child, and most of his few remaining warriors, he was shot by a renegade Pokanoket. His boy, the last of his line, was sold into slavery in Bermuda. His race was given over to the executioner and the slave dealer; his territory went to Plymouth, and, half a century afterwards, to Rhode Island. But it was no bloodless victory that the colonies had won. "The towns are so drained of men," wrote Leverett, governor of Massachusetts, in the thick of the contest, "we are not able to send out any more." Six hundred of the best colonists had perished; ten times that number, and more, had suffered from the losses and the agonies which befall even the survivors of a war. Six hundred dwellings were burned; many a town was partially, many a one totally destroyed. The mere expenses of the war amounted to something enormous in comparison with the actual means of the colonies. It is pleasant to meet with the record of a contribution of five hundred pounds, collected by an elder brother of Increase Mather, a Puritan minister in Dublin. The war had lasted a little more than a year, (1676.)

Peace. There still remained a few Indian war parties to deal with in the Connecticut valley, as well as the Abenaki tribes in Maine. The former were soon driven off; but the latter kept to their arms until peace was literally bought of them by Sir Edmund Andros, the governor

of New York, to which province, it may be remembered, the eastern part of Maine then belonged, (1678.)

Abenakis in arms.

The Abenakis were soon in arms again. Enlisted on the side of the French in the wars to be related by and by, the eastern tribes repeatedly laid waste the English settlements. A quarter of a century (1689–1713) did not still the passions thus excited. At a time of peace between England and France, the colonists of the former nation attacked the allies, nay, the very missionaries of the latter. Sebastian Rasles, the patriarch of a Norridgewock village on the Kennebec, where he dwelt alone amidst his savage converts, became the object of especial jealousy to the government of Massachusetts. An armed expedition failed in making him captive, (1722.) But a renewed assault was more successful, the venerable priest being slain, his chapel sacked, his village destroyed, (1724.) All the tribes of the east entered into the war. The only ally of Massachusetts was Connecticut; the efforts to obtain support from the Mohawks being answered by the advice that Massachusetts should do justice to her foes, (1722.) Peace was made, after a five years' conflict. It was broken more than once in the later French wars, (1744, 1754.) But the Abenakis submitted at last, (1760.)

Peace in the centre and south.

The central and southern colonies were for many years undisturbed by Indian wars. Treaties with the Five Nations — the more easily made and kept as these tribes were continually at enmity with the French of Canada — protected the frontiers of the colonies of the centre. Those of the south, for some time unassailed, were at length overrun.

War in North Carolina.

North Carolina, after frequent aggressions on the part of her settlers, was swept by the Tuscaroras, (1711.) The aid of South Carolina, with that of her Indian allies, was called in, before peace could be re-

stored, even for a brief period. Soon breaking out again, in consequence of the continued injuries inflicted upon the Indians, the war grew so threatening as to require the interposition of Virginia as well as of South Carolina. The three colonies together forced the Tuscaroras to fly to their kindred, the Five Nations of New York, by whom, as was formerly mentioned, they were received as a sixth tribe of the confederacy, (1713.)

In South Carolina. South Carolina, some time before involved in strife with the Indian allies of the Spaniards in Florida, was presently threatened with a more serious war. The tribes of the south, especially the Yamassees, aggrieved by the treatment which they received from the colonists, dashed upon their plantations, and, with revenge and slaughter, pressed northward towards Charleston. So great was the peril, that the governor armed the slaves of the province, besides obtaining a law from the assembly authorizing the conscription of freemen. These means, backed by the resources of North Carolina and Virginia, averted the ruin that appeared to be approaching. The Yamassees, driven back with their confederates, were forced to seek refuge in Florida, (1715.)

With Cherokees. Nearly half a century elapsed before the Indians took up the hatchet in the south. The Cherokees, invaded first by the forces of the Carolinas and Virginia, and then by the royal troops, at that time carrying on the last French war, retorted with sword and fire, (1759–60.) But the English and the colonial soldiery together proved too much for the Cherokees, who were soon reduced to humiliating terms of peace, (1761.)

With western tribes. Meantime, the western settlements had begun to bear the brunt of Indian warfare. Pennsylvania was attacked, just as the final contest with the French began, (1755,) by the Delawares and Shawanoes,

the former of whom had been infamously driven from their land by the Pennsylvanians, or their proprietors, many years before. Other tribes, joining with these, spread havoc along all the western borders of the colonies, until peace was conquered, (1758.)

Pontiac's war.

The French war over, (1763,) the same tribes, with others of varied name and race, united under the great Ottawa chieftain, Pontiac, in one simultaneous attempt to clear the western country of the English invaders. Such an onslaught, occurring at an earlier period, might have driven the English, not only from the west but from the east. But made against them when they had just prevailed against the hosts of France, the attacks of the Indians, though at first successful, were met and decisively subdued, (1764.) *

Indians in Pennsylvania.

Some sad and strange events, in connection with the war thus closed, must be mentioned, for the sake of the illustration which they offer of the passions so long dividing the English and the Indians. A number of Pennsylvanians, opposed to their own authorities, and excited with suspicion and hatred against all of Indian blood, made such demonstrations against the Indian converts of the Moravian missionaries, for some time at work in Pennsylvania, that the assembly ordered the Indians to be removed to Philadelphia. Hardly was this done, when the settlers of Paxton, a frontier town, put to death a handful of Indians lingering at Conestoga, pursuing and slaying some who, for safety's sake, had been lodged in the Lancaster jail. A force of from five to fifteen hundred borderers then set out on a march against Philadelphia, where they intended to seize the Indians transported thither, if not to make themselves masters of the city and the province altogether

* The extreme western tribes remained in arms till 1765.

They were not without their sympathizers in Philadelphia; but those who were prepared to resist them took so determined a course as to avert the dangers of the insurrection. The show of force in the city persuaded the borderers to retire, (1763–64.)

Other wars, but the issue decided.

The tomahawk was not yet buried in the west or in the south. Year after year some party or some tribe of Indians broke loose upon the frontiers. But the question had long been decided as to the hands into which victory was to fall. The scattered tribes, ill provided with arms or stores, with discipline or skill, had fallen away, from the first, before the concentrated numbers and accumulated resources of the colonists. Whatever individual bravery could do, whatever the undying independence of any single tribe could achieve, was all in vain, before the resistless advance of the English. Nay, not of the English alone, but of the Indians themselves, allied with the conquerors of their countrymen. But for such as joined the stranger, the conquest would have been slower, although none the less sure.

Later missions.

The Indian wars form by no means a bright chapter in our history. But, as we found something to light up the early, so we find something to light up the later relations of the Indians and the English. The missions, begun by the Mayhews and by Eliot, had never been abandoned in Massachusetts. As time passed, and the native race grew thinner upon its former soil, new stations were taken, to reach the remoter tribes. A mission at Stockbridge, at first in the charge of John Sergeant, afterwards obtained no less a superintendent than Jonathan Edwards, (1737–50.) A more radiant name is that of David Brainerd, of Connecticut, who, after laboring between Stockbridge and Albany, turned southwards to Pennsylvania and New Jersey, (1744.) The exertions of a few years so enfeebled

him that he returned to the Connecticut valley only to die, (1747.) His place was taken in Pennsylvania by Moravian missionaries, (1748,) whose labors, protracted to a much later period, came to such sad results as have just been described. The missionary would convert the Indians; the colonist would hunt them to death. Alas, that so little was wrought by the friend and the teacher, in comparison with the vast achievements of the foe and the destroyer!

CHAPTER V.

Dutch Wars.

Wars with Indians.

Returning to trace the fortunes of the Dutch settlement of New Netherland, we immediately find it, like its English neighbors, at war with the Indians, whom we may call Manhattans of the Algonquin race. Vexed by the traders, oppressed by the officials of the colony, the Manhattans had provocation enough to take up arms at an early period. But the vicinity of their dreaded foes, the Mohawks of the Five Nations, who were disposed to be friends with the Dutch, kept them at peace until peace was impossible. The incursions of the Indians into the Dutch settlements, and the horrid massacres inflicted by the Dutch in return, were of the same nature as the hostilities already described, (1640–43.) A temporary truce was instantly broken by a general war, spreading from the main land to the islands, and devastating almost the whole of the colony. But for a company of English settlers, just fresh from encounters with the Indians, it would have gone hard with New Netherland. As it was, the exhaustion of the colony was as great as that of its foes, when a treaty terminated the war, (1643–45.) Thrice, however, within the next twenty years, the Indians rose against the still oppressive Dutchmen, (1655, 1658, 1663.)

The increase of New Netherland was arrrested by

Effect upon New Netherland.

these repeated wars. A contemporary document* (1644) dwells upon the favorable prospects of the colony after the fur trade was thrown open, (1638,) as previously mentioned. "At which time," we are told, "the inhabitants there resident not only spread themselves far and wide, but new colonists came thither from fatherland, and the neighboring English, as well from Virginia as from New England, removed under us." The hopes thus inspired are expressly stated to have been blasted by the Indian wars.

Internal restrictions.

Had the wars never occurred, the colony would have had no rapid progress. In itself it was divided by what may be called castes. The patroons, for instance, were an order by themselves, not necessarily hostile to the authorities or unfriendly to the colonists, yet often proving to be one or both. Then the colony lay at the mercy of the company and its director, whose supremacy was shared by none but a few officials and councillors. The attempts at representation on the part of the more substantial colonists, were of no avail. Boards of twelve, eight, and nine men were successively established, with the director's consent, but without any power to restrain him or to elevate themselves. It was at length resolved by the nine men to draw up a statement of their grievances to be laid before the government of the mother country. But the member charged with preparing the document, Adrian Van der Donck, was robbed of his papers, thrown into prison, and expelled from the board of the nine men as well as from the director's council, in which he had a seat, (1649.) Liberated from his imprisonment, Van der Donck set sail for Holland, with other representatives of the cause for which he had suffered. His exertions there brought about

* In O'Callaghan's History of New Netherland, Appendix E.

a provincial order from the States General, by which the West India Company was directed to make some concessions to the colony, (1650.) Two years elapse, and we find Van der Donck still appealing to the States General for justice, (1652.) The most that he procured was a municipal government for the city (as it was styled) of New Amsterdam, the first city of the United States. It was organized in the following year, (1653,) with sheriff, burgomasters, and judges, but all appointed by the director, Peter Stuyvesant, who had carried on for several years a downright war in defence of his prerogatives. In resentment against him personally much of the vigor belonging to the liberal party had been expended. He carried the day, it must be confessed, notwithstanding the city charter, notwithstanding also the remonstrances of a convention of eight towns held the same year.

Religious persecution.

The measure of arbitrary government was not yet full. At the instance of two clergymen of the Dutch church, a proclamation from the director appeared, threatening fines upon all preachers and hearers of unlicensed congregations, (1656.) The first to suffer were Lutherans, who were not merely fined, but imprisoned; then some Baptists, who were not merely fined, but banished. Soon after, a few Quakers fell into the hands of the persecutors, one of them being subjected to tortures as horrid as any inflicted in the English colonies, (1657.) A few years afterwards, the remonstrance of a Quaker, John Bowne, who had been transported to Holland as a criminal, brought upon Director Stuyvesant the censure of the company for his oppression, (1662–63.)

Subjection of New Sweden.

Despite all these drawbacks upon its strength, New Netherland was strong enough, with help from the company, to subdue its neighbor of New Sweden. That colony, though reënforced at times, con-

tinued in a precarious state, with few settlers and uncertain resources. Protested against by the Dutch as interloping within their territory, it had nevertheless invited Dutch emigrants amongst its own settlers, (1640.) But the New Netherland authorities were on the alert. Partly in opposition to a Connecticut settlement attempted on the Delaware, but chiefly in resistance to the advances of the Swedes, Stuyvesant built his Fort Casimir at the present Newcastle, (1651.) A new governor, Rysingh, coming to the Swedish colony, got possession of the fort without difficulty, (1654.) It cost him dear; for Stuyvesant, with a force of several hundred, principally sent from Holland for the purpose, not only recovered Fort Casimir, but conquered Fort Christina and the whole of New Sweden, (1655.) A few Swedes swore allegiance to the Dutch; the rest went home or emigrated to the English colonies. The Swedish government protested against the conquest of its colony; but it had too much upon its hands in Europe to recover its possessions in America. So New Sweden came to an end; and the dream of the generous Gustavus Adolphus that he was to found a place of refuge from persecution and from corruption vanished forever.

New Amstel. The victorious West India Company hardly knew what to do with its conquest. It found a purchaser, however, in the city of Amsterdam, which became the mistress of what had been New Sweden, — portions of our Delaware and Pennsylvania, — under the name of New Amstel, (1656.) This was enlarged by a subsequent purchase so as to embrace the Dutch possessions on both banks of the Delaware; in other words, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, (1663.)

English aggressions. But the dominions of the Dutch, whether West India Company or Amsterdam city, were passing into other hands. The claims of England to the

territory had been asserted, as mentioned in a former chapter, from a very early period. They lost nothing, it may be believed, of their force, as colonies multiplied and lands were in continually increasing demand. An old grant from the Council for New England * was made to cover Long Island. Connecticut and Massachusetts pushed on towards the Hudson. On the south, parties from Connecticut and from Maryland threatened the domains upon the Delaware, (1639–63.) Year after year, during a quarter of a century, brought some fresh invasion of the English, exciting some fresh remonstrance from the Dutch. "Those of Hartford," runs one of the Dutch records, "have not only usurped and taken in the lands of Connecticut, but have also beaten the servants of their high mightinesses the honored company with sticks and plough staves, laming them," (1640.) It is the tone of all the records, querulous and feeble, the wail of a colony never numbering more than ten thousand against its far more numerous neighbors. Nor were its neighbors its only foes. Amongst its own people was a large number of Englishmen, emigrants from hostile colonies, who naturally became hostile settlers. At one time, some English villages of Long Island proclaimed "the commonwealth of England and his highness the lord protector," (1655.) At another, the towns at the west end of the island proclaimed the English king, (1663.) Finally, the danger was so great that Peter Stuyvesant, the foe of all liberal institutions, called a convention of his province. It appears how far the English had pushed their aggressions on scanning the meagre list of the towns or settlements that were represented. New Amsterdam and Rensselaerswyck head the roll of twelve. The convention favored peace with the Indians; as for the English, why, the English in New Netherland alone were "six to one," (1664.)

* To the Earl of Stirling, (1635.)

War; loss of the province.

Long as the dissensions between the English and the Dutch had lasted, neither the colonies nor the mother countries had gone to war about them. A war of two years (1652–54) between the Dutch and the English under Cromwell did not involve their American settlements. When England came under Charles II., another war with Holland was resolved upon, partly from commercial and partly from political motives, the chief of the latter being the intimate connection at that time between the Dutch and the French. Before war was formally declared, New Netherland was surprised by an English fleet. It did not come as a national, but as an individual expedition. Charles II. had made a grant, as has been narrated, of New Netherland to the Duke of York and Albany. It had been the work of a few months only for the duke to buy up other English claims, and collect commissioners and troops to take possession of his new realms. Accompanied by John Winthrop, governor of Connecticut, who, though amiable and disinterested in most respects, was full of determination against the Dutch, the commissioners, headed by Colonel Nichols, obtained possession of the province without battle. The terms of the surrender promised to the conquered their religion, their law of inheritance, and their trade and intercourse with Holland, (1664.) The transaction, at first professedly discountenanced by England, was afterwards sustained by her, and finally submitted to by Holland in the treaty of Breda, (1667.)

Recovery and final loss.

On the outbreak of fresh hostilities between the same countries, a few years later, (1672,) New York, as New Amsterdam was now called, received the summons to capitulate to a Dutch squadron, (1673.) It did so, and was held by the Dutch for upwards of a year, when it was once more, and for the last time, surrendered by them, (1674.) Thus were the Dutch, and with them the Swedes, brought beneath the English dominion.

CHAPTER VI.

Spanish Wars.

Spanish race.

There were other races, rivals of the English, less easily to be reduced than the Dutch or the Swedes. One upon the southern border bore the flag of Spain, rent and dim indeed, but still the flag of a great nation.

Its colony.

Yet the colony of the Spaniards was far from being a great one. St. Augustine, eldest of the permanent settlements upon United States soil, was amongst the least active of them all. Half garrison, half mission in its character, it formed a post where a few troops and a few priests kept up the Spanish claim upon Florida. A century after its foundation, it was nearly annihilated by one of the buccaneering expeditions that were wont to ravage the American coast. It rallied, however, especially when a treaty between Spain and England put a stop to the English commissions with which the buccaneers of the time were generally provided, (1670.)

Collisions with the English.

But there was no good will to speak of between Spain and England, or amongst their colonies. A force from Florida was soon marching against the newly-organized Carolina, a more flagrant incursion, in Spanish eyes, upon the territory still claimed by Spain, than any of the northern colonies had made. The expedition was met and turned back by the resolute Carolinians, (1672.) Some years after, another invasion of the Span-

iards effected the destruction of a Scotch settlement just made near the Spanish border, (1686.) These were not wars so much as the chastisements inflicted or attempted by Florida against its English trespassers.

Effect on the colony.

If there was any effect, it was not to dislodge the intruders, but rather to stimulate the intruded upon. Florida took a fresh start. St. Augustine awoke from its slumber, brushed up its means of offence and defence, and assumed a new attitude. The surrounding country, still in the hands of the Indians, was dotted over with forts and chapels, with soldiers and missionaries. On the other side of the peninsula, upon the Gulf of Mexico, Pensacola was reared with fortress and dwellings, (1696.) It seemed as if Spain was at last to occupy our soil with a colony worthy of bearing her great name.

War. Attacks on St. Augustine and Charleston.

Presently war broke out between England with various allies on one side, and on the other Spain and France, (1702.) It was but just heard of in South Carolina, when Governor Moore obtained the consent of the assembly to an attack upon St. Augustine. With twelve hundred men, half of them Indians, Moore was able to take the town, but not the fort, from which he precipitately retreated on the arrival of some Spanish men-of-war from Havana, (1702.) Poorly as his expedition turned out, Moore, no longer governor, headed a second, composed almost entirely of Indians, with whom he made a foray amongst the missionary villages of Northern Florida without any effective results, (1705.) The next year, a naval attack by both French and Spaniards upon Charleston was beaten off with great loss, three hundred out of eight hundred assailants being killed or captured, (1706.) This was the last event of the war, so far as the colonies were concerned, although peace was not made until seven years later by the treaty of Utrecht, (1713.)

Treaty of Utrecht. This treaty is of moment in United States history. The war, of which it was the conclusion, arose from the attempt of Louis XIV. to seat a prince of his own house upon the Spanish throne; in other words, to combine Spain and France in one vast kingdom. So menacing was the attempt to Europe, that not England alone, but Holland, Germany, both the Empire and Prussia, Portugal and Savoy armed themselves against it. The treaty of Utrecht decided that France and Spain must remain separate. Had they been joined, the English colonies upon our shores would have found it difficult to withstand their united foes.

Second war. Descents on Florida. Five years after, France was on the side of England in a war with Spain, (1718.) It was caused principally by the refusal of Spain to fulfil the Utrecht treaty so far as related to the empire of Germany, with which power France and England, and then Holland, all allied themselves. Afterwards, Spain and the Empire made peace together, while France, England, and Holland formed a league against them, (1725.) Little was done either in Europe or in America. Pensacola was taken and retaken by the French, then in their Louisiana settlements, (1719.) It was soon restored, (1721.) A force of three hundred, partly Indians, made a sally from Carolina upon the Spanish and Indian villages of Florida, (1725.) But the war was without interest or effect, and peace returned with the treaty of Seville, (1729.)

Third war. Georgia and Florida. Then followed the settlement of Georgia, already described as intended to be an outpost against the Spaniards, (1733.) Whatever they thought of this fresh aggression upon their realm, they seem to have said or done nothing for some time; then General Oglethorpe, the head of the Georgian colony, was sum-

moned to evacuate the territory, (1736.) War being declared by England against Spain, chiefly in consequence of Spanish depredations upon English commerce, Oglethorpe received orders to invade Florida, (1739.) He did so, with a force of twelve hundred men from both the Carolinas and Virginia, as well as from his own province, besides an equal number of Indians. With these, and with trains and ships, he laid siege to St. Augustine; but being deserted by most of his Indians, and by many of his volunteers, he was obliged to abandon the enterprise, (1740.) A large expedition from England, reënforced, first and last, by upwards of four thousand colonial troops, was equally unsuccessful against the Spanish strongholds in the West Indies, (1740–41.) But the Spaniards themselves did no better in their invasion of Georgia, from which they were repelled, partly by battle and partly by fraud, Oglethorpe being still there, (1741.) After this, the Spanish war subsided, nor did the French share in the hostilities begin for three years to come, (1744.) Four years later, the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle restored things to their state before the war, (1748.)

Fourth war. Cession of Florida.

Just as the last colonial war with France was ending, the fourth and last colonial war with Spain began. This power came into the contest as the ally of France, in America even more than in Europe, the object being to prevent the English expelling the French from their American possessions, and then turning against the Spaniards, as was apprehended, and expelling them from theirs. But the French were already driven out; and nothing interfered with a vigorous onset of the English upon the Spaniards. New England and New York contributed to the capture of Havana in the opening year of the war, (1762.) The treaty of Paris, begun upon in the same, though not formally completed till the

following year, restored Havana to Spain. But it gave an immense accession of territory to England and her colonies. What France surrendered will appear hereafter. Spain ceded Florida, once the whole of North America, but now little more than a peninsula of the southern coast, (1763.) A royal proclamation of the same year gave names and boundaries to East and West Florida, the latter province embracing the French cessions east of the Mississippi. Twenty years after, the Floridas reverted to Spain, to be again separated from it at a later period.

Spain in Louisiana and California.

To make some amends to Spain for her losses in attempting the rescue of France, the latter kingdom gave up her colony of Louisiana. To this we shall revert. At nearly the same time that the Spaniards took possession of their acquisition in the east, they extended their settlements in the west by establishing missions at San Diego and Monterey, California, (1769.)

Character of the Spanish wars.

But the Spanish wars, so far as our country was concerned, were over. They had never arisen, except in the case of the last brief war, from any consideration of American interests. Nor had they called forth any development of American energies either in crowded battles or extended campaigns. But they had continued, if we date from the first encounters, for nearly a century.

CHAPTER VII.

French Possessions.

French race. THE great rival of the English race upon our soil reappears. It is time to turn back beyond Spanish, Dutch, and Indian wars, nay, beyond the growth of the English colonies, to trace the progress of the French in America. No other nation, it will be found, not even the English, asserted claims or projected achievements of equal vastness.

New France. We left the French the masters of New France — a name of vague extension originally, but subsequently confined, as will be remembered, to Acadie and Canada. Acadie being itself shorn of its original dimensions, the province of Canada remained the chief division of New France.

System of government. The French, like the English colonies, were not always under the immediate government of the mother country. An intermediate authority, vested in the Company of New France, prevailed for thirty-five years, (1627–62.) For twelve years more, a French West India Company was commissioned to administer the affairs of the colony, (1663–75.) But with these bodies were associated some officers of royal appointment, so that there was no time when the colony was wholly removed from the oversight of the sovereign. Nor was the season during which the two companies lasted by any means so long or so decisive as the periods of the royal government. New

France, like Old France, was essentially a monarchy, and a monarchy in which the monarch was growing out of all proportion to the people. Its institutions were of the past. A governor general, representing the monarch, with an intendant for a prime minister, a council of notables for a nobility, and a host of ecclesiastics, with a bishop at their head, (from 1659,) constituted the authorities of the colony. The ruling class amongst the people was that of the seigneurs, or lords of the manor; their tenants, called habitans, holding land of them by feudal tenure. No press was allowed; no learning of a liberal nature was encouraged. The education of the province was in the hands of the religious orders, whose names and numbers were almost as manifold as in the mother-land. Under these influences, the colony could not but be greatly restricted. The main body of the people were necessarily dependent, unable to act for themselves or for their country, the few alone having the will and the power to urge on the work of colonization and of dominion.

Relations with Indians and English.

Such were the internal drawbacks upon the progress of New France. Of those which we may call external, the chief were the relations of the French with the Indians and the English. Those with the Indians were of two kinds — with the friendly and with the unfriendly tribes. Now it may seem that the amicable intercourse of the French with the large proportion of the natives around them must have been entirely conducive to their prosperity. But it did not prove to be so, on account, principally, of the tendency of the French settlers to sink to the level of their Indian allies, rather than to raise these to themselves. The Frenchman, whether missionary or soldier, explorer or trader, appeared to find a fascination in savage life which he could not resist; and yet it was the vices rather than the virtues of the

Indian character which he admired and imitated. He became indolent, treacherous, morosely cruel, in many instances far more of a savage than any Indian. As to the hostile tribes, it is enough, at the present moment, to name the Five Nations, with whom, as will appear hereafter, the French were at war for a century. As to the English, it must be left to the next chapter to set forth the obstacles which they presented to French advancement. It is sufficient to observe that these hinderances from without, joined to those from within, formed a bristling barricade over which all the ardor and all the discipline of the French character would find it difficult to mount. The stronger must have been the impulses to have extended the limits of New France so far as we shall now find them.

Acadie, including Maine.

The boundaries of Acadie stretched from the northern coasts, through all the east of Maine, as far as the Kennebec, the French asserted; as far as the Penobscot, the English allowed. With the portions of the province in the north we have no further concern than to observe that they included all now called Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Cape Breton, together with indefinite regions beyond. Maine was but feebly held by the French. Missions at the mouth of the Penobscot and on the Kennebec, with a post or two for trade, comprised all that could be called settlements. But for the towns and forts of the neighboring parts of Acadie, the east as well as the west of Maine would have fallen into English hands.

Canada, including New York, Wisconsin, Michigan.

Passing over the cities and fortresses of Central Canada, as foreign to our soil, but not without remembering their importance, let us pursue the Canadian settlements that were made or attempted upon actual United States territory. The first to advance was, as usual, a missionary, Le Moyne, who, with a few associates, labored amongst the Five Na-

tions, then at peace. A colony was founded in Western New York, but only to be abandoned on account of renewed warfare between the French and Indians, (1656–58.) A few years later, Allouez, another missionary, led the way up the lakes, and founded the mission of St. Esprit, on the southern shore of Superior, in the present Wisconsin, (1666.) Two years after, Dablon and Marquette established a mission at Sault Ste. Marie, in the present Michigan, (1668.) Other missions arose in the adjoining forests and on the contiguous shores. After the missionary came the trader, and after the trader generally the soldier; so that to the mission house there were added dwellings, barracks, and, in time, a fort, whose sounding title frequently drowned the peaceful name of the mission. Thus was Canada extended beyond the St. Lawrence and its tributaries, beyond all neighborhood of the English colonies, into the valleys and the wildernesses of the west.

The Mississippi. Illinois.

Still more distant realms were reached. Father Marquette, of the Michigan mission, hearing of a great river towards the setting sun, resolved to find and to explore it. Before he started, his brethren, Allouez and Dablon, penetrated into the interior of Wisconsin and Illinois, (1672.) Marquette, with a few companions, found the Mississippi, as he had been directed by the natives, and sailed upon its waters as far down as Arkansas, (1673.) On his return, he established a new mission near the present Chicago in Illinois.

Louisiana.

The tidings from the Mississippi kindled new plans of trade, new visions of dominion. To begin upon them, there soon appeared a Frenchman, La Salle,—in youth a Jesuit, in manhood a trader and an adventurer of the highest stamp amongst the colonists of New France. Repairing to the French court, he obtained a commission to complete the discovery of the great western river, in consid-

eration of which the monopoly of the fur trade was to be his own, (1677.) He soon engaged in his enterprise; but four years of exertion and of disappointment passed over him, before he descended the Mississippi to its mouth and to the adjacent coasts. It did not matter that the Spaniard De Soto had been the discoverer of the river a century and a half before the French. They hailed themselves possessors of the waters and of the shores, under the name of Louisiana, (1682.)

French dominion. Thus was New France extended from north to south, and from east to west. While the Swedes and the Dutch had yielded their hold upon our soil, while the Spaniards had contracted theirs to the single corner of Florida, while the English had only their New England, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, and Carolina, the whole together forming not much more than a broken beach upon the Atlantic, the French dominion stretched from the Gulf of St. Lawrence, over vale, and prairie, and mountain, far round by the western waters, to the Gulf of Mexico. It still needed time, vigor, wisdom, to make this mighty empire a reality as well as a name.

Colony in Texas. No time was lost in sending La Salle, who had gone to France to tell his adventurous story, with a colony of two hundred, to make a settlement in Louisiana. Missing the mouth of the Mississippi, the party were landed on what is now the Texan shore, near the present Matagorda, where they built a fort with the name of St. Louis, (1685.) But things went hard with them, and when they were reduced to less than a fifth of their original number, La Salle found it time to seek relief in Canada. On his way thither, with half of his surviving comrades, he was foully murdered by one of them, (1687.) The colony of St. Louis soon vanished from the earth.

Twelve years passed before another trial to colonize Louisiana. A twofold attempt was then made, one by the

Colony in Mississippi.

English and one by the French. The old grant of Carolana having been bought up by one of the later New Jersey proprietors, Coxe, he sent, under permission of his sovereign, a small squadron to take possession of the Mississippi. One of the vessels, sailing up the river, was met by a band of Frenchmen, who, by assuring the Englishmen that they were in a part of Canada, and not in Louisiana, prevailed upon them to turn about at a bend still called the English Turn — Détour aux Anglais. So the English retired, and the French held their own. They were a party of two hundred in number, under Lemoine D'Iberville, a Canadian of greater gallantry than prudence, who, intent upon mines and treasures rather than upon the substantial resources of a colony, chose the sands of Biloxi, in what is now Mississippi, for the site of his fort, (1699.) The next year, an expedition in search of mines travelled up the river as far as the Falls of St. Anthony, first visited by some of La Salle's companions twenty years before.

Colony in Alabama.

The mines receded; the sands of Biloxi remained. D'Iberville, returning from France, whither he went twice in quest of supplies, transferred the main body of the settlers to Mobile, in the present Alabama, (1702.) But D'Iberville, who, like La Salle, was the life and the soul of his company, died, (1706,) and left the colony in a very precarious condition. "Nothing," says the French chronicler, "was more feeble." The truth was, that France was at this time too much occupied in Europe, to say nothing of the north of America, to rear a great colony in the wilderness of Louisiana.

Grant to Crozat.

At length the province, extending from the mouth of the Mississippi to Lake Michigan, and from the English Carolina and the Spanish Florida to the New Mexico of Spain, was made over, for the term of fifteen years, to Antoine Crozat, a French merchant prince. He

was to receive a large sum every year from the royal treasury towards the expenses of the colonial government, besides the monopoly of trade to and from the colony. In return, he was to send a certain number of vessels and settlers, year by year, in order to keep up and to increase the colonial settlements, (1712.) A faint flush of vigor seemed to overspread the struggling colony.

Western settlements. Indiana.

Meanwhile the settlements in the north-west had been extended. The missions of Kaskaskia, (about 1695,) and Cahokia, (about 1700,) in our Illinois, and the settlement of Vincennes, in our Indiana, (about 1705,) had confirmed the occupation of that region. A military post was planted at Detroit, the central point in the great arc now formed by the French possessions, (1701.)

Loss of Acadie.

But we have reached a period when the French possessions were beginning to be contracted. The war in the north, to which we must recur, had ended with the surrender, according to the treaty of Utrecht, of Acadie to England, (1713.) What was thus cut off at the end of the line was more than equal, in point of population and of settlement, to all that had been added to the middle or to the lower end.

Forts: Pennsylvania and Ohio.

Nor was there any reaction to compensate for the loss. Canada, it is true, roused herself, building forts upon New York territory, at Niagara, (1726,) and Crown Point, (1731.) Western Pennsylvania was dotted with fortifications, at the same time that others were raised through the Ohio valley, (1753.) But the most to be gained by these posts was a communication with the valley of the Mississippi and with Louisiana, where there was little to make the communication of any sensible importance.

Louisiana, soon resigned by Antoine Crozat, had passed under the control of the Company of the West, otherwise

Mississippi Company: New Orleans.

known as the Mississippi Company, (1717.) During the frenzy of its speculations, both the colony and the mother country were inflated, merely to collapse with disappointment and disaster. Otherwise, the only office rendered by the company to the colony was the establishment of its capital at New Orleans, (1718–23.) The company soon returned the colony upon the royal hands, (1730.)

Missouri: the thirteen of France.

Our narrative ends with the final outbreak of hostilities between the French and the English in America, (1754.) Forty years had passed since the treaty of Utrecht began the rupture of the French possessions; but how much was there still left! Beyond the limits of the United States the domains of the French were far more valuable, within the same limits they were far more extensive, than those of England. Over and above the colonies and posts that have been mentioned, the first essays were made, at the epoch in question, towards the occupation of our Missouri. Counting by the states of a later period, we have thirteen of French* to match with the thirteen of English parentage.

Vastness and weakness.

Enough has been said, however, to explain how easily the French possessions were extended by adventure, and yet how slightly they were either held or developed by actual settlement. The French dominion was as weak as it was vast. It spread over America like a cloud brilliant with the morning sunshine; but, unsubstantial as a cloud, it was swept by the breeze and rent asunder by the storm.

* Three of each division were the same. The French list comprised Maine, New York, and Pennsylvania, with Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Louisiana, Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, Indiana, Ohio, and Missouri.

CHAPTER VIII.

French Wars.

Wars with Indians in the north.

The earliest wars in which the colonies of France engaged were those with the Indians. They were also the longest. From the time when Champlain headed a war party of Algonquins against the Five Nations of New York, (1609,) this great confederacy was at war with the French, some intervals of peace excepted, for more than a century. To describe the descents upon the Canadian settlements, the wild cries and the wilder deeds of battles, the waste and the agony of homes, would be but to repeat our previous sketches of Indian warfare. Not until the treaty of Utrecht restored peace for a time between France and England did the Five Nations, then the allies of the English, bury the tomahawk that had so long gleamed above the heads of the French, (1713.)

In the south.

Later wars with Indians broke out in the south. The Natchez were beaten, (1729–30,) but the Chickasaws could not be subdued, (1736–40.) These conflicts, however, were of moment chiefly to Louisiana. They did not affect the destinies of the French possessions generally.

Strife between the French and the English.

Except the brief contest with the Spaniards of Florida, described in the last chapter but one, the French had no wars to conduct against any European race besides the English in America. This,

it is true, was enough for the French to contend with. Enemies for ages past in Europe, these nations turned to America in rivalry and contention. It was to outvie each other, in a great degree, that they made their settlements; claiming the same lands at the beginning, and extending themselves in the same directions as time went on. The strife between the two great combatants began at an early period, as long ago related, when England, or rather England's colony of Virginia, destroyed the French settlement of St. Sauveur, (1613.) Continued by England herself, (1628–30,) war produced no effect; her conquests, as was mentioned, being surrendered, (1632.)

Indecisive wars. The wars of the next half century were not a whit more decisive. One, during the English commonwealth, (1652–56,) reduced Acadie for a time beneath the sway of England. Another, after the restoration, (1666–67,) brought about nothing except a proposal to the New England colonies that they should conquer Canada. Peace restored Acadie, as far as the Penobscot, to France, leaving once more no results from the passion and the hostility that had been aroused.

King William's war. Acts of violence did not cease on either side. An English trader on Lake Huron was seized, as a trespasser, by the French, (1687.) At the other extremity of New France, the governor of New England, Sir Edmund Andros, made an assault upon the trading post of a Frenchman on the Penobscot, (1688.) Each race was determined to hold, and, if possible, to increase its own. A fresh trial of their strength — the fourth in all, but the first in which the colonies of either nation took an active part — began with the war called King William's by the English colonists, (1689.) As far as concerned England, then under William III., the chief cause of the war was the support given by Louis XIV. to the lately

dethroned James II. But Louis had excited in one way or another the greater part of Europe. England was supported by the German Empire, Holland, Spain, and Savoy. From Europe the strife extended to Asia, as well as to America.

Its character and course.

The difference between the contending parties in America soon appeared. On one side was the mother country rather than the colony, the strength of France rather than the weakness of Canada and Acadie. On the other side was the increasing vigor of New England and New York, supported at one time by grants from Maryland and Virginia, and thus presenting an array of colonies, rather than a single mother-land. Both sides were alike in the allies gathered from the forest and the prairie; the Indians of Canada, Acadie, and Maine following the French, while the English were assisted by the forays of the Five Nations along the Canadian lines. Indeed, the war was more of an Indian than of a European one in character. It began with the descents of French and Indian war parties upon Schenectady in New York, Salmon Falls and Casco in New England, (1690.) An expedition from Massachusetts against Acadie, and another, partly from New England and partly from New York, against Canada, were more regular operations, (1690.) The latter scheme was prepared in a convention of delegates from Massachusetts, Plymouth, Connecticut, and New York, held in the last-named colony; and although Canada was not invaded, the plans all failing, the colonies were united, at least for a season, by new bonds. The Massachusetts force, under Sir William Phips, succeeded in ravaging Acadie, and even in seizing the eastern part of Maine, where a fort was presently constructed at Pemaquid, (1692;) but this was retaken in a few years by the French under D'Iberville, (1696,) the same who

appeared in the south at a later time. Peace being made between the French and the Five Nations, — who were really far more formidable enemies than the English, — while the Abenakis of Maine still swept the frontiers of New England, a general invasion of the northern colonies was planned by the French, (1696–97.) But the apprehensions of the English were happily relieved by the treaty of Ryswick between the mother countries, (1697.) The war, though lasting eight years, had produced no sensible effect upon the relative strength of the parties engaged in it, nor had it decided any of the differences that had led to it, or that would lead to fresh strife in the future.

Religious differences.

One of these differences has not yet been brought out as it should be. Between the French and the English there existed the widest and the deepest gulf that ever opens between man and man or between nation and nation. It was the chasm between opposing creeds. Both professed to be Christians; but the French were Catholic, the English Protestant. To the former the latter were heretics, the rightful objects of human enmity as of divine. To the English Protestant, on the contrary, the French Catholic was the minister of a superstition and an oppression as hateful to God as to man. It may be conceived how much these feelings contributed to whet the swords and to blunt the sensibilities of the warriors on either side. Sad, indeed, is the grouping of the two nations upon the American page, staining it with the passions of the old world, the more hateful in the new, because allied with the savage and the heathen.

Queen Anne's war.

No marvel, then, that warfare was soon renewed. Four years after the peace of Ryswick, Queen Anne's war began, on account, as has been related, of the designs of Louis XIV. upon the Spanish crown,

(1702.) In America, the same Indian alliances were formed, the same Indian hostilities were excited, as in the preceding contest, except that the Five Nations did not take up the hatchet against the French until the war was two thirds over, (1709.) There were also the same attacks upon the border settlements; Deerfield (1704) and Haverhill (1708) being both wasted by the French, while the French territory about the Penobscot was scoured by the English, (1704.) But the war, as a whole, was characterized by greater and more decisive operations. Two expeditions were directed from New England against Port Royal; the first laying waste the adjoining country, (1707,) the second capturing the town; the very name of which disappeared in that of Annapolis, (1710.) The first permanent settlement of the French, it was also the first permanent conquest from them by the English. Two expeditions, likewise, were planned by New England, New York, and New Jersey, against Canada; the first being merely planned, (1709,) and the second, though attempted, failing through the inefficiency of the admiral conducting the English force in aid of the enterprise, (1711.) As in the last war, so in this, the northern colonies of England were arrayed against France rather than her colonies. The English colonies of the centre were inactive; those of the south were occupied at this period, as must be remembered, with Spanish and Indian hostilities. Twelve years having passed in warfare, peace was made at Utrecht, and France surrendered Acadie to England, (1713.) The war was the first of the five between the two nations to make any change in their American possessions.

Collision in the west.

New points of collision were appearing in the west. As early as the beginning of the last war, a treaty with members of the Five Nations was made the basis of an English claim to vast territories,

(1701.) To explain the claim on any principles is not very easy. It not only made out the Five Nations to be the masters of the west, far beyond their own borders, but also made out the English king to be the master of the Five Nations. A quarter of a century afterwards, a new treaty with the same tribes actually transferred to the English a portion of the country claimed by them, (1726.) Meanwhile the pretensions of the English to the entire interior, from the coast on which their colonies were planted to the Pacific, had never been abandoned. It was their right, they alleged, to possess the western, if they occupied the eastern shores. To aid the English advance towards the west, a trading post had been established at Oswego. It now became a fort, (1727.) But where it stood, and where its range, so to speak, was meant to extend, the French claimed the sovereignty.

And in the east.

There were also difficulties, both old and new, arising in the east. The war between the English and the Abenakis, in which French missions were assailed, and a French missionary was murdered, threatened fresh hostilities, (1724.) The French, on their side, exasperated, perhaps, by the loss of Acadie, were inclined to infringe upon English rights. Acadie, they argued, was only the peninsula, or what is now called Nova Scotia. But the English replied with reason, that it was not only the peninsula, but the adjoining mainland, and even the surrounding islands. Yet to these the French held fast, especially to Cape Breton, where stood their stronghold of Louisburg, by far more important in their eyes, and in those of their adversaries, than any of the inconsiderable posts upon the territory that had been surrendered.

King George's war.

At length, after a third of a century of nominal peace, war was renewed, (1744.) It was called King George's by the English colonists, from

George II. His interposition in favor of Austria and Sardinia, then combined against France and Spain with other powers, led to a French declaration of war; Spain, as may be recollected, being already at war with England. France was now under Louis XV. The French being at peace with the Five, now the Six Nations, and the Indians within the English limits being much diminished in numbers and in spirits, the European races fought their battles more by themselves. An expedition, proposed by Massachusetts, and supported by men from Connecticut, New Hampshire, and subsequently Rhode Island, as well as by supplies from New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, all under the command of William Pepperell, of Maine, and all accompanied by a fleet from England, accomplished the reduction of Louisburg in less than two months, (1745.) A still more extensive campaign was projected for the following year, when New England, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, and Virginia, with a grant from Pennsylvania, and an armament from England, were to invade Canada; but the English force did not appear, and rumors of a French descent upon New England broke up the colonial ranks, (1746.) France did little of any kind. Her troops at Crown Point made some incursions into Massachusetts and New York, but the meditated invasion of New England was an utter failure. The treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle closed the war, four years after its outbreak, restoring Cape Breton and Louisburg to France, (1748.)

Blood shed in Nova Scotia.

Peace was soon broken. An attack upon the French at Chignecto, on the Isthmus of Nova Scotia, caused the first blood to be shed, (1750.) Forts rising in various places betokened additional conflicts. It was evident that the troubles in the east were far from being allayed.

Nor was the prospect calmer in the west. At the expi

The Ohio Company.

ration of the last war, a number of individuals, partly Englishmen and partly colonists, associated as the Ohio Company, obtained a grant of half a million of acres on the eastern bank of the Ohio River, (1749.) Virginia, whose governor was interested in the enterprise, took the lead in the treaties with the Indians and the negotiations with the French required by the plans of the company. But the French were not to be made friends of on that ground. They attacked an Indian settlement where some English traders had found refuge, and seized them as prisoners, (1752.) They then assailed the troops of the Ohio Company. A Virginia party, sent to construct a fort at the head of the Ohio, was driven back by a French force, who completed the fortification, and called it Fort Du Quesne, (1753–54.)

Blood shed in Pennsylvania. George Washington.

A larger band, already on the march from Virginia to the disputed territory, was soon engaged in battle with the French upon Pennsylvanian soil. The first encounter between detachments from both sides resulted in the defeat of the French; but the second, between the main bodies at the Great Meadows, ended in the retreat of the Virginians. They had been bravely led, their leader being George Washington. An envoy of peace to the French before he thus appeared as an officer in war, he was the same in character, if not in experience, that he showed himself to be in after years. He was now but twenty-two.

The final struggle.

It was the final struggle that had thus begun on the shores of Nova Scotia and in the forests of Pennsylvania. The mother countries came into collision in the following year, (1755.) Then the English fleet took some French transports off Newfoundland, and followed up the attack by scouring the seas. The land forces were equally active. One army, partly of colonial and partly

of English troops, marched under General Braddock to defeat near Fort Du Quesne. Another, exclusively colonial, first under General Lyman, and then under Sir William Johnson, with Mohawks in the train, routed the French under Baron Dieskau at Lake George, and built Fort William Henry. But they made no attempt at the reduction of Ticonderoga and Crown Point, against which they had originally started on their march. Another colonial force under the English General Shirley, setting out to reduce Fort Niagara, ventured no farther than Oswego. The only expedition to succeed was one that even the victors might afterwards wish to have failed. Not content with forcing the French troops to evacuate their forts on the Isthmus of Nova Scotia, which was done by a force from Massachusetts, aided by a few hundred English soldiers, the conquerors decided to drive the entire population of the territory into exile. Seven thousand miserable creatures, separated from their families, and bereft of their possessions, were thrown upon the charity of the English colonies, where every association, religious and social, national and individual, was against them. Thus opened the war, (1755.) It was formally declared in the spring of the following year, (1756.)

Extent.

Like the last of the Spanish wars, which broke out in connection with this, the last French war sprang from American causes, at least to a great degree. Actual hostilities occurred in America near six years sooner than in Europe. But Europe did not sit looking across the seas. She armed herself for her Seven Years' War, as it was styled. Prussia was on the side of England, Austria on that of France. Russia and Sweden took part against Prussia, rather than for England. After Spain came in on the French side, Portugal declared in favor of the English. Germany was the chief scene of

action in Europe. Asia and Africa also furnished battle grounds.

Losses of the English.

American operations were for some time yet more adverse to the English than those already described. Niagara, Crown Point, and Du Quesne continued the objects of attack and of defence; but far from being able to take them, the English were unable to defend their own posts. The fort at Oswego yielded to the Marquis of Montcalm the same year that war was declared, (1756.) The next year, (1757,) Montcalm was the master of Fort William Henry. Thus, after four campaigns, (1754–57,) the English were retiring before the French. Yet the resources of the English had been infinitely greater than those of their foes. Canada, which bore the brunt of war, did not contain more than twenty thousand effective troops; and even these were in danger of becoming ineffective by their isolation from the mother country, on which the French colonists were ever wont to rely.

Their subsequent victories.

It was not surprising, therefore, that the renewed exertions of England, and above all of her colonies, by which alone twenty thousand men were now raised, should repair the losses of the preceding years. Louisburg was the first prize, the whole Gulf of St. Lawrence being taken possession of immediately. Fort Frontenac, on the northern shore of Ontario, and Fort Du Quesne were found deserted. Amongst those who marched against the latter fortress, only to see it in ruins, was Washington, then at the head of the Virginian forces. There, where he had fought his first battles, where he had been twice obliged to retreat, once in command and once in Braddock's staff, he now made his last appearance in the war. His strength was reserved for a greater conflict. All these acquisitions of the English were made in one year, (1758.) The next brought the abandonment of

Ticonderoga, Crown Point, and Niagara, and more momentous still, the surrender of Quebec, after the great Montcalm's defeat by the troops whom the greater Wolfe had led to amazing victory, (1759.) The two years, together, decided the war.

Conclusion of the war.

But it continued a year or two to come. An attempt of the French to regain Quebec being repulsed, Montreal soon after capitulated to the English, who were acknowledged conquerors of Canada, (1760.) All but a few posts in the farther west were surrendered to them within the following year, (1761.) Meanwhile operations, previously commenced, were renewed against the French West Indies by an armament composed in part of colonial troops; the islands of the Caribbean group being all captured, (1759–62.) There was no such thing as fighting against reverses like these. After twelve years of actual warfare, the French made peace; the treaty of Paris ceding to England all east of the Mississippi save two little islands, St. Pierre and Miquelon in the north, and New Orleans in the south; this last, with all west of the same river, being transferred to Spain, whose part in the war has been previously described, (1763.)

The French retire.

The French colonists were loath to give up the territory which their mother country had surrendered. Such of the western posts as were not not already in possession of the English did not come under their new masters for a year or two, (1765.) Indeed, it was some months after the treaty that a French party under Pierre Laclède established a new settlement at St. Louis, in our Missouri, upon the lands ceded to Spain, (1764.) Several years more passed before the Spaniards installed themselves in Western Louisiana, (1768.) But the French nation had played its part as a power on United

States territory. Not the less lasting, however, were the influences that had arisen from its possessions and its wars while they endured.

French and English compared.

The issue of the French wars needs little comment after what has gone before. The English, in their compact colonies, resembled a man in full armor, in contending with whom, the French, scattered over their disjointed settlements, were like a knight protected by nothing but fragments of his coat of mail. The Englishman, moreover, stood strong in himself, strong in his colony even more than in his mother land; but the Frenchman leaned upon the distant France, with all his enterprise a dependent colonist, with all his gallantry a submissive subject. So much for the causes and contrasts that were at work in America. If we return to Europe, we shall find France too much engaged in ambition and in battle there to put forth her strength for the defence of colonies as languishing in fact as they were magnificent in form.

CHAPTER IX.

Colonial Development.

Development of territory.

The English territory was immensely increased by the successful wars that have been described. Nor were its limits extended solely at the expense of neighboring domains. Within the boundaries already belonging to the colonies of England, there had been a large accession to the lands formerly occupied. New fields were brought into cultivation; new towns were formed; new means of communication were opened between the old habitations and the new.

Of occupation.

The development of territory arose chiefly from the development of occupation. As the numbers and wants of the colonists multiplied with time, they found fresh ways of employing and of enriching themselves. The seaboard was lined with merchants and traders; the interior was filled with farmers and planters; while around them all were clustered the artisans and the laborers whose services were needed to complete the circle of toil. Few men, or even women, in the early period, were without some laborious pursuit; few, as wealth increased and individuals grew to be above the necessity of labor, laid aside industry altogether. In one light, the entire people is seen exerting itself to improve the soil, to build up the dwelling, to enlarge the limits of commerce, of trade, and of manufacture. How successful these exertions were, appears from the steady growth of the colonies in resources and in possessions.

Of habits of life. The habits of the colonists were long of the simplest nature. Little space for liberality or for luxury could be found in a new land crowded with its ever-recurring demands for sobriety and for self-denial. Wherever men lived, in the little knot of cottages that was called a town, in the scattered villages of the country, in the isolated posts of the frontier, they had a narrow life before them. Afterwards things changed, and in many a spacious enclosure there arose dwellings of greater comfort and of greater pretension. As the strict rules of the primitive period were loosened, there was also more frequent and more genial intercourse amongst men and amongst women. Without falling into extravagance, the wealthy found new objects of expenditure. Without yielding to idleness, the poorer classes found new means of relaxation. The change was for the better, physically and mentally. It relieved the nerves that had been tightly strung. It enlarged the interests that had been closely confined. If it did away with the primitive simplicity, it also did away with the primitive ruggedness of life. Time was gained for thought, for culture, for expansion.

Of education. The sources of education had been opened at an early period. The first laws of Massachusetts provided for the schoolmaster and the school, each township of fifty families being bound to maintain a teacher of reading and writing, while each of a hundred families was called upon to set up a grammar school, (1645–47.) The example was generally imitated throughout New England. Some of the central colonies were equally on the alert, Pennsylvania, especially, making provision from the first for public schools, (1685–89.) Maryland was much later in the field, proposing schools long before she established them, and laying them, when established, under the restriction of being taught only by members of the church of England,

(1723.) The southern colonies were mostly behindhand in the matter of education. South Carolina was amongst the earliest to organize public schools, (1721;) but these, like the schools of almost all the country, were of a very limited design. Private instruction being preferred by the richer colonists, the schools were left to the middle and lower classes, whose interest was not strong enough to support them.

Colleges. The patronage of the upper classes turned to the colleges which began with Harvard, in Massachusetts. Virginia, after depending upon a Latin school at New Amsterdam, bestirred herself to have a seminary of her own. At the instance of the Bishop of London's commissary, — the ecclesiastical head of the province, — James Blair, the long-sleeping project of a college was revived. The aid of the king was invoked; and he granted a charter, with donations in money and lands, to create a corporation, whose chief charge it should be to provide instruction for such as proposed to take orders in the established church. A department was also to be organized for the education of Indians. The royal names of William and Mary, then king and queen, were bestowed upon the rising institution, (1691.) Connecticut soon had her Yale College, (1700;) New Jersey her College of New Jersey, (1738–46;) New York her King's College, (1754;) and Pennsylvania her Academy, (1750,) afterwards the University of Pennsylvania. These institutions became the centres of quite an amount of intellectual activity.

Of the press. The printing press had long been at work. The first to be set up was at Cambridge in Massachusetts, (1639.) But it was under so much restraint that it can hardly be said to have exerted any general influence. The importation of books was under similar hinderances, certain volumes being absolutely prohibited, (1654.) Not-

withstanding, the trade seemed to flourish, there soon being as many as four bookstores in Boston, while libraries were gathering on a small scale, (1686.) The first newspaper of the colonies was a diminutive sheet, issued once a week, under the title of the Boston News Letter, (1704.) No other press kept pace with that of Massachusetts. The royal governor of Virginia, Sir William Berkeley, made it a boast that under him "there are no free schools nor printing." "God keep us," he profanely added, "from both!" (1671.) Not many years after, the owner of a press introduced into the colony was bound over to make no use of it until the royal pleasure could be consulted. The royal pleasure turned out to be, that the press and its proprietor should leave Virginia, (1682–83.)

Official interference.

The increasing activity of the press is proved by nothing more clearly than the continued interference to which it was subject from the colonial officials. In time, the governors of the royal provinces were regularly instructed to allow no printing without their special license, (1702.) It was virtually the same in all the colonies. In Pennsylvania, a printer was called to account for one of his publications in such a way as to suggest a retreat to New York, (1692.) Thirty years subsequently, the publisher of the Philadelphia Mercury, the only newspaper out of Boston, was obliged to apologize for an article displeasing to the governor and the council, (1722.) "I'll have no printing of your address," says Governor Shute of Massachusetts to the House of Representatives, on their remonstrating against his proceedings; "the press is under my control." But he did not succeed in preventing the printing, or even in bringing the printers to trial, (1719.) It was not because the Massachusetts press was free. On the contrary, within a very few years, Benjamin Franklin, then a boy of seventeen, was admonished by a joint committee of the council

and the house for certain articles of his in his brother James's paper, the New England Courant, James himself being thrown into jail for a month in consequence of having allowed Ben's animadversions upon "religious hypocrisy," (1723.) Cosby, governor of New York, went farther than Shute against the freedom of the press. His council, with whom he was having a violent dispute, took to a newspaper, the Weekly Journal, of which John Peter Zenger was the publisher. The governor, although he had his organ in the New York Gazette, determined that the council should be deprived of theirs, and that Zenger should be punished. After an imprisonment of eight months, Zenger was tried for libel, and escaped condemnation only by the exertions of his counsel, Andrew Hamilton, of Pennsylvania. The little sympathy that there was with Zenger on the score of a free press may be conceived from the fact that, though acquitted, he was left to bear the losses of his imprisonment, (1732–33.)

Editions of the Bible.

It was a striking proof of advancing energies that the Boston press gave in issuing an edition of the Bible, the privilege of printing the English version being a monopoly of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. The Boston edition bore the imprint of the king's printer in London, (about 1752.) A German Bible had been already printed in Germantown, Pennsylvania, (1743.)

Intellectual development: in action.

The intellectual development of the colonies was altogether of a grave cast. To trace it in action, we are obliged to follow the men of the time into circumstances where exertion, anxiety, and devouring care exclude all lighter aspects. We seldom find the graceful mind or the sportive spirit; it is all solemn deliberation, weighty argument, the natural methods of dealing with subjects so serious and relations so momentous as those in which the colonists were involved.

In literature. Pass from men of action to men of contemplation, and the same signs appear. The primitive writings treat of matters of life and death to their authors. Whether it is the chronicler, like Governor Bradford, of Plymouth, or the traveller, like John Lederer, in Virginia, each wears a sober countenance and tells a sober story. If we penetrate into the mazes of witchcraft literature, as much of the early New England writings may be styled, we find that what look to us like the wildest hallucinations then appeared the sternest facts. Imagination, it is true, had much to do with them; but it was imagination excited to that degree in which the unreal seems more true than the real. At a later time, the colonial literature assumed lighter forms. There were writers of travels, of essays, even of poems, to some of which we shall presently advert. But the chief men of letters were still of grave mien; indeed, there was hardly one out of the clerical ranks. The influence of clergymen upon literature as upon life was very sensible for many years beyond the period of which we treat. At the head, perhaps, of the colonial writers, was the theologian and the metaphysician Jonathan Edwards, a native of Connecticut and a minister of Western Massachusetts, whose treatise on the Liberty of the Will reads like a plea for all the gravity of learning as well as for all the severity of dogma then vanishing away.

In science. Science found its earnest votaries. There was one, indeed, whose inquiries were so resolute and so brilliant as to throw lustre over the whole country. Benjamin Franklin, a student and a writer from his early youth, at the same time that he was a hard-working printer, solved the mysteries of the thunder cloud, into which, frequently as it appeared, science had not then actually penetrated, (1752.) Nor were his electrical discoveries the only results of his scientific attainments. A sometime neighbor of

Franklin, John Bartram, of Pennsylvania, whom the great Linnæus called "the first natural botanist in the world," was the creator of a botanic garden near Philadelphia, and at the same time the explorer of the whole country from Canada to Florida, (1751–66.) His son, William Bartram, continued the work begun by the father, leaving an account of his own journeyings as full of freshness as the forests and the plains which he explored. Another branch of science was nobly cultivated by John Winthrop, a descendant of the Massachusetts governor, who occupied the chair of mathematics and natural philosophy at Harvard College. His astronomical observations, continued for many years, (1740–79,) enlarged the sphere of knowledge in Europe as well as in America.

In art.

Art, even in its lower forms, was hardly recognized. The dramatic exhibitions, attempted at a late day in Boston, were instantly interrupted by the Puritan authorities, (1749.) In the towns and colonies more tolerant of amusement, there was nothing better than a strolling company, which was obliged to wander in turn from Newport to Williamsburg, (1752.) The first dramatic composition of the country was the Prince of Parthia, (1759,) a tragedy by Thomas Godfrey, a native of Philadelphia, whose poetic aspirations were much more successful than those of his countrymen before him. A few musical instruments, a piece or two of ordinary sculpture, a larger proportion of paintings, might be found in the more refined mansions. The first organ for a church encountered so great opposition in Boston that it remained unpacked for several months after its arrival from England, (1713.) Thirty years afterwards, an organ of considerable excellence was constructed in Boston itself by Edward Bromfield, (1745.) The musical publications of the period, beginning with "The Cantus or Trebles of twenty-eight Psalms,"

under the supervision of Rev. John Tufts, of Newbury, (1710,) were chiefly confined to psalmody. Portrait painters were making their appearance; the first two, Watson and Smybert, being both from Scotland. John Singleton Copley, a native of Boston, and Benjamin West, a native of Springfield, in Pennsylvania, gave better promise of the art that was yet to walk in beauty through the nation.

Influences from abroad.

The intellectual progress of the colonies was sensibly affected by influences from abroad. Not merely that the literature, the science and the art of other countries were within the reach of the new people, but that they were actually brought to its door, so to speak, by sojourners from beyond the sea. An English naturalist, Mark Catesby, was a visitor to Virginia and South Carolina, (1712–22.) A Swedish man of letters, Peter Kalm, travelled through all the central colonies, (1748–51.) His name still dwells amongst us in the *kalmia*, a genus of plants embracing our beautiful mountain laurel. A group of clerical visitors came at about the same time. George Berkeley, afterwards Bishop of Cloyne, spent some years (1729–31) at Newport, spreading around him the influences of a cultivated and a devout spirit. He tarried there on the way to the Bermudas, where he hoped in vain to found a college for the youth, Indian and English, of America. Georgia was visited by the Wesleys, John and Charles, (1736–37,) then just entering upon their efforts as reformers in the English church. George Whitefield, at first the churchman and then the sectary, traversed the whole land from north to south; his appeals to the people resulting in revivals, as the phrase went, which were repeated until the charm began to lose its power, but not before it had greatly loosened the hold of ancient doctrines, (1738–70.)

Liberality in religion.

Of all the progress that we have to notice, no point is more remarkable than the increasing lib-

erality in religion. It was beginning to be seen that men might be fellow-Christians without being fellow-churchmen or fellow-Puritans. Dissenters found toleration in the church-province of Virginia, (1698.) On the other hand, the Puritan churches made peace with their antagonists. Cotton Mather, preaching at the ordination of a Baptist, expresses "our dislike of every thing which looked like persecution in the days that have passed over us," (1718.) Churchmen in Massachusetts were released from Puritan tithes, (1727.) Baptists and Quakers were both released from the same tithes in Massachusetts, (1728,) New Hampshire, (1729,) and Connecticut, (1729,) the last colony, however, continuing the restrictions upon separate places of worship. Even the Roman Catholics had their crumb of toleration. On their celebrating mass in Philadelphia, the governor proposed to enforce the penalties of the English, not the Pennsylvanian, law against them; but the council opposed the proceeding, on the ground that the Roman Catholics were protected in the charter of the colony, (1734.) The air seems to grow freer as we meet with such a record. But it was not yet purified. Charles Carroll, a Roman Catholic of Maryland, found himself so hemmed in by illiberality, that he petitioned the French government for a grant in Louisiana, (1751.)

Church of England.

The church of England — the moderate church of the reformation — was the mean, as formerly described, between the extremes of the Roman and the Protestant sides. But, as the Roman church was hardly represented in the colonies, the church of England appeared to occupy, not so much a mean as an extreme position, the opposite to the extreme of Puritanism. It was, therefore, the great foe of Puritanism, just as Puritanism was its great foe. Both the churchman and the Puritan found it hard to bear and to forbear with each other, the more so as

the church of England increased, and assumed the lead. John Checkley, preparing to be a church missionary, threw the Puritan clergy of Boston into quite an excitement, by taking upon himself to say that there could be "no Christian minister without episcopal ordination," (1724.) So, when the Massachusetts ministers, headed by Cotton Mather, petitioned the General Court that a synod of their churches might be convened, as in former days, the church clergy appealed to England for the suppression of the proposed assembly, (1725.) It was not merely ill will that these proceedings kindled; it was apprehension of oppression.

Project of bishops.

Dissenters generally, but with the Puritans still in the van, stood arrayed against a project in which the church of England was deeply interested. As early as the reign of Charles II., a bishop for Virginia had been nominated at the instigation of the prime minister Clarendon, (1672.) It proved merely a nomination. Thirty years passed, when the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts (1701) took up the matter, partly in consequence of applications from the churchmen of the colonies, (1703.) It was twelve years more before the society, after petitions to and answers from Queen Anne, undertook "a draught of a bill, proper to be offered to the Parliament, for establishing bishops and bishoprics in America," (1715.) The queen's death interfering with the execution of these projects, they were laid aside, resumed, and then laid aside again until some of the English prelates, members of the society still, espoused the cause so full of interest to them and to their church. Their plan, drawn up by Bishop Butler, of Durham, was not one, it would seem, to provoke opposition. It suggested the limitation of the episcopal power to the clergy in orders, declaring, at the same time, that "no bishops are intended to be settled in places where the government is in the hands of dissenters, as in New

England," &c. Such, however, were the difficulties attending the scheme, even in this modified form, that it failed, (1750.) Its advocates, joined or succeeded by others, did not give up the hope of carrying their point at a future time. But the passions of the colonists, as well from political as from religious causes, ran too high to admit of further provocation. Nor were dissenters only arrayed against the plan of the episcopate. Churchmen were almost equally earnest, on account, chiefly, of the jealousy entertained in relation to the mother country. So that when, at a later time, the Bishop of London's commissary for Virginia called a convention of his clergy, to discuss an address to the king, "upon an American episcopate," certain clergymen, who protested against the proposal, received the thanks of the House of Burgesses for their course, (1771.) The clergy of Virginia, however, and the Burgesses had long been on poor terms, in consequence of certain acts passed by the latter to the detriment of clerical revenues, indeed, to the violation of clerical rights, (1755–58.) The church of England, it must be confessed, was far from being a church of peace in the colonies.

Classes: the slaves. The classes in the colonies remained the same as heretofore. But the relations between them were varying with their members and their numbers. Amongst the echoes from those distant years we catch the sounds of sympathy for the enslaved. Some German, not English, Quakers of Pennsylvania began by declaring against the whole system of slavery, (1688.) An English Quaker of the same colony was stirred to make the same declaration; but his remonstrance was mingled with fanaticism and sedition, (1692.) A few years later, Pennsylvania pronounced against the importation of Indian bondmen, (1705.) Massachusetts passed a similar prohibition, (1712.) But when Pennsylvania, or a portion of its people, petitioned for

the general emancipation of the slaves in the province, the assembly rejected the proposal, (1712.) The slaves did not every where sit still while the masters legislated. New York was thrown into terror by a negro plot to fire the city, (1712.) South Carolina was twice threatened by a negro massacre, (1730, 1738.) It was not to be expected, with all the advantages or all the alleviations of slavery in the English colonies, that the system was to escape the dangers and the wrongs to which it had led in every land and in every age of its history. One earnest voice was lifted up against it in the colonies by John Woolman, of New Jersey, a Quaker of singular refinement as well as singular simplicity, who published Some Considerations on the Keeping of Negroes, towards the close of the period, (1753.) Woolman's Journal of his life and his devotions should be mentioned as one of the most attractive works in our early literature.

Colonies: union. Between colony and colony there were new bands of union. Suggestions of combining them in some common organization had appeared from time to time. The first project of the sort, on the part of the colonies, was of William Penn's proposal. He urged a congress of twenty members, to be elected by the colonial assemblies, with a president appointed by the king. This body was to keep the peace amongst the colonies, to regulate their commerce, and to secure their defence, (1697.) A quarter of a century later, Daniel Coxe, of New Jersey, brought forward a plan of much the same nature, (1722.) Thirty years later, the deputies of seven colonies — the four of New England, New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland — met at Albany on the recommendation of the secretary of state in England, (1754.) The subjects before this assembly were the relations of the colonies with the Indians and with one another, referring chiefly to the war then opening between England and France. It was to promote the mil-

itary rather than the civil union of the colonies, that Benjamin Franklin, a deputy from Pennsylvania, laid his proposals before the convention. He suggested a council of forty-eight, apportioned to the contributions of each colony, who were to conduct the affairs of war, and, to a certain extent, the affairs of peace; the members, chosen for three years, by the colonial assemblies, to elect their own speaker, but to be under a president, or governor general, nominated by the crown. This system suited neither those who favored nor those who opposed the interests of the colonies, the appointing power and the veto, with which the president was armed, being deemed as unfavorable to colonial liberty as the rights of the council were to royal prerogative. It was at the same time that the king commanded one of his ministers, the Earl of Halifax, to prepare a plan of colonial union. Each colony was to elect, by common consent of assembly, council, and governor, a single commissioner to a federal body, by which a revenue was to be raised and the general defence assured. A commander-in-chief was to be placed at the head of the government, which, as we see, was a merely military organization. Union was not to be achieved by a fluctuating succession of projects like these.

Contributions to Boston.

The sympathy existing amongst the colonies appears on another record than that of systems or assemblies. A great fire, breaking out in Boston, caused immense loss and immense distress, (1760.) What Boston itself could do was promptly done; its people were not in the habit of giving up, however severe the trial. But there came a large sum from New York, another from Pennsylvania, besides one from Nova Scotia, and various subscriptions from England. The colonial contributions to Boston proved that there were bonds, if not yet drawn together, still capable of being tightened, closely and lastingly, amongst the colonies.

CHAPTER X.

The Mother Country.

Views of the mother country.

As the colonies passed through the struggles of infancy into the promises of manhood, they wore a new look in the sight of the mother country. Something more than had been anticipated was to be hoped, something more also was to be feared from them. It seemed as if they might be able to contribute largely to the resources of the mother-land; and yet it seemed as if they might think themselves able to withhold as well as to contribute. Strange symptoms of insubordination had appeared. The crown, the parliament, and the officials by which both were represented, had been confronted, here and there, with amazing boldness. It was high time, so thought the English rulers, to take the colonies in hand, to tighten the reins of government, and to confine them to the course marked out, as it was thought, by the interests of the mother country.

Board of trade.

Chief of the agencies put in operation was the board of trade, consisting of a president and seven members, entitled the Lords Commissioners for Trade and Plantations, (1696.) To this body were committed the functions hitherto exercised by committees of the privy council, but now magnified into large powers of administration. It was intrusted with the execution of the navigation acts, to which were at this time appended fresh and oppressive provisions of colonial Courts of Admiralty. It was also empowered to carry out the new acts by which not merely

the trade but the administration of the colonies was to be brought under stricter control. The royal approval of all colonial governors, and the conformity of all colonial laws to the statutes of Parliament, were amongst the first steps to be taken. The board entered heartily into its mission. It proposed the appointment of a captain general with absolute power to levy and to organize an army without reference to any colonial authority, (1697.) It laid a prohibition upon the exportation of colonial woollens, even from one colony to another, (1698.) It actually went so far as to recommend the resumption of the charters that remained to some of the colonies, (1701.) Time and again, a bill was brought into Parliament to declare the charters void; but, for one reason or another, the design was postponed. The board of trade, approving itself by its zeal, became a sort of ministerial body on being attached to a secretary of state as its chief, (1714.) Its course, however, was not improved. The secretary longest in office (1724–48) — the Duke of Newcastle — supposed New England to be an island. The board of trade acted as if they thought all the colonies a broken cluster off the British coast.

African Company. About the same time that the board of trade was organized, the Royal African Company, previously a monopoly, was so enlarged as to allow general participation in its operations. What these were appears from its name. But the name gives no indication of the near connection of the company with the American colonies, of their restiveness, and of its oppressiveness. "Give due encouragement," say the royal instructions of Queen Anne to the governor of New York and New Jersey, "to merchants, and, in particular, to the Royal African Company," (1702.) "The slave trade," reëchoes Parliament, half a century afterwards, in making the trade independent of the African Company, "is very advantageous to Great Britain,"

(1750.) It was, in fact, a cardinal point in the treaties of England with the European powers. The treaty of Utrecht contained a contract on the part of Spain that her colonies should be provided with slaves by Great Britain alone, (1713.) The treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle was followed by a convention indemnifying Great Britain, to the amount of a hundred thousand pounds, for relinquishing the monopoly of the slave trade with the Spanish colonies, (1750.) The closer was the gripe upon the English colonies. Vainly did Virginia and South Carolina, for instance, lay a prohibitory duty upon the importation of slaves; their acts were annulled by the royal command. And by what reasoning, it will be asked, were the advantages of the traffic upheld in the mother country? The answer is simple. In the first place, the profits of the African Company and of the private slave traders were enormous. In the second place, the dependence of the colonists in agriculture, manufacture, and trade, as well as in government, was assured, so long as they were kept to slave labor. This was openly avowed in England; so that, resist as they would, the colonies were at the mercy of the Royal African Company as long as it endured.

Colonial governors.

The boards and companies of the mother country found congenial instruments in the governors of the various colonies. All but those whom the colonists were able to elect for themselves, as in Connecticut and Rhode Island, may be said, as a general remark, to have been the main stays of the policy pursued by the English authorities. A needier, greedier set of men was never sent forth to rule than the spendthrift courtiers, the broken-down officials, and the cringing colonists, who successively appeared in the scramble after colonial spoils.

An illustration offers itself in the career of Edward Hyde, Lord Cornbury, grandson of the great Earl of Clar-

Cornbury in New York.

endon, and cousin to Queen Anne, by whom he was appointed governor of New York, (1702.) His arrival was greeted with delight by a faction then suffering from the reaction consequent upon Leisler's cruel fate, ten years before. The party opposed to Leisler and his adherents, now getting the upper hand, voted an enthusiastic grant to his lordship the governor, and doubled his salary besides. He was not contented; but, on the vote of a large sum, in the ensuing year, for the fortification of the Narrows, he appropriated it to himself without leave or license. This drove the assembly to insist upon having a treasurer of its own — a demand that was afterwards allowed by the queen, (1705.) Cornbury became more and more odious to those who had welcomed him with rapturous obedience. One assembly after another was dissolved for not meeting his multiplied requisitions. Two Presbyterian missionaries from England were prosecuted by him on no other charge than their creed, but were triumphantly acquitted by the jury, (1707.) His course was much the same in New Jersey, then under the New York governor, where, after violent assaults upon the political and religious privileges of the colony, he was met face to face in the assembly by charges of oppression and corruption, (1707.) Such proceedings as Cornbury's were too wanton to be tolerated even in England. He was recalled, but without any other amends besides the recall, for the indignities from which New York and New Jersey had suffered during seven bitter years, (1709.)

Burnet and Belcher in Massachusetts.

Some years pass, and the then governor of New York, Colonel Cosby, complains to the board of trade of "the example of the Boston people," (1732.) With his views and with the views of the board there was ample motive for complaint. William Burnet, formerly governor of New York, now of Massa-

chusetts, had made it a point, from his first entrance upon his new government, to obtain a permanent salary, (1728.) The House of Representatives would not hear of such a thing, much preferring their usual mode of a yearly vote. This the governor scorned, and hinted at the loss of the charter in case he was denied his will. A town meeting of the Bostonians sustained the house with so much effect that Burnet held the next General Court at Salem. Boston is the proper place for our sessions, declared the sturdy representatives. "Then meet in Cambridge the next time," rejoined the governor, (1729.) Burnet dying, one of the agents sent to complain of him in England, Jonathan Belcher, was appointed his successor. But the colonist was soon involved in the same disputes as the Englishman, both, in the present case, obeying instructions rather than following their own desires. After a two years' controversy, Belcher obtained leave from England to accept a salary for the year, (1731.) Even this was cut off, on his opposing, as he was instructed to do, the further issue of paper money, already a sore subject in Massachusetts. Belcher wrote to the board of trade that a crisis was at hand. The house, on the other side, wrote to request the king to recall the governor's instructions, (1732.) On the king's refusal, the agents of the house made the same request to Parliament. "This is a high insult," replied that body, "upon his majesty's government, and tending to shake off the dependency of the colonies," (1733.) The House of Representatives restored the salaries which it had suspended; but some fresh disputes arising, the removal of Belcher was asked for and obtained, (1740.)

Clinton's appeal.

A few years later, and Governor Clinton of New York, failing to obtain a grant for five years, appealed to the secretary at the head of the board of trade "to make a good example for all America," (1748.) What

his idea was, appeared more clearly when he begged that Parliament would impose certain taxes to provide "the civil list," (1750.) It was the natural result of the exactions and the clamors of the previous half century. But even before the half century began, Clinton's appeal had been anticipated by a scheme of parliamentary taxation, brought forward at the time when the board of trade was entering upon its career, (1696.)

Parliamentary interference.

Meantime Parliament had not left the administration of the colonies entirely in other hands. It extended the post office of Great Britain to America, (1710.) It regulated the system of naturalization, until then different in the different colonies, by requiring a probation of seven years, and an oath of allegiance, together with the profession of some form of Protestantism, (1740.) It interfered with questions of currency and of banking,* in which, indeed, the colonies had got far beyond their depth, (1740–51.)

Commercial rule.

All the while, Parliament maintained its authority over the colonial trade. Never, in truth, had it gone so far as when it passed what was called the "molasses act," laying duties on molasses, sugar, and rum imported from any but the British West India Islands, (1733.) "It is divesting the colonists," said the agent of New York in England, "of their rights as the king's natural born subjects and Englishmen, in levying subsidies upon them against their consent." Parliament was also extending its interference with manufactures in the colonies. It crowned its acts on this score by prohibiting the exportation of hats, (1732,) and the erection of mills for slitting or rolling iron, and of furnaces for making steel, (1750.) The commer-

* It was the way with most of the colonies, beginning with South Carolina, (1712,) to issue bills which were loaned to individuals as a borrowed capital.

cial rule, commenced by the navigation acts of a century before, was thus approaching its completion.

Military rule.

Another rule was beginning to appear. The wars in which the colonies were involved led to their subordination beneath the military and naval commanders of the mother country. It was inevitable that the English officers should assume a superiority which would be felt, not merely in the field, but in the town — not merely amongst the soldiers, but amongst the citizens of the colonies.

Impressment at Boston.

Wild work was that which Commodore Knowles made in undertaking to fill up his fleet by the impressment of Bostonians. The people seized his officers who happened to be on shore, and, retaining them as hostages, took such an attitude of fury and of strength, that Governor Shirley withdrew to the Castle in the harbor. Knowles threatened the bombardment of the town. The upper classes, through their representatives in the house, and in a town meeting of their own, abjured all connection with the so-called populace. But they who had risen for the sake of saving their brothers and their neighbors from outrage, though wholly deserted, were not wholly unsuccessful. The greater part of the men who had been pressed were surrendered by the commodore, and peace ensued. Yet there was more parade at the return of the governor than at the rescue of the artisans and the sailors of the town from their captivity, (1747.)

A commander-in-chief of the colonies.

Clouds were gathering heavy with menace and with ruin. An order went forth from the board of trade to the colonial governors, directing them to raise a fund for the general expenses of the colonies, then driving, with the mother country, into the fiercest of the wars with France. At the same time, the mutiny act, providing for the discipline and the quarters

of the English army, was extended to the colonies, (1754.) The next year (1755) brought over the Earl of Loudoun, governor of Virginia, and commander-in-chief of the whole thirteen. As the general fund to support his authority did not appear, Parliament addressed the colonial assemblies with the assertion that "the claim of right in an assembly to raise and apply public money by its own act alone is derogatory to the crown and to the rights of the people of Great Britain," (1757.) Both the property and the freedom of the colonists were thus involved in the establishment of a military rule.

Judicial tenure.

The signs were dark in all directions. Most of the colonial judges had long been appointed by the crown, or by its representatives the governors; but once appointed, they were independent, as they held office during good behavior. But Chief Justice Pratt, of New York, received a commission to continue only "at the king's pleasure." In vain he remonstrated with the governor of the province; in vain the governor supported the remonstrance in an appeal to the board of trade. "Your good behavior," answered the board, "is a pernicious proposition." So the secretary at the head of the board maintained, in instructing the colonial governors to issue no commissions "but during pleasure." All this was stranger and more threatening than any previous act of the powers in England. New York showed its sense of the danger by refusing any salary to the chief justice. He, however, procured from the board of trade a grant, to be paid out of the royal quitrents of the province, (1761–62.)

Writs of assistance.

With all the game now in view, the authorities still stuck to their "acts of trade." Francis Bernard, lately governor of New Jersey, and at present of Massachusetts, had but just assured the latter colony of the "blessings from their subjection to Great Britain,"

when they were thrown into alarm by an application of the custom house officials to the Superior Court for writs of assistance, authorizing search after merchandise imported in defiance of the acts of trade. The hearing came on before Chief Justice Hutchinson, who was also the lieutenant governor. All that legal skill, as well as official influence, could do to obtain the writs, was done; but the counsel whom the Boston merchants had retained stood out to the last — Oxenbridge Thacher, "soft and cool;" James Otis, "a flame of fire." "Every man," says one who was present, "of an immense crowded audience appeared to me to go away as I did, ready to take up arms against writs of assistance." Of course, the writs were granted, but they were little used, (1761.) The same spirit that had resisted them broke out against the schemes of taxation with which the acts of trade were now connected. "Government," argued James Otis, "must not raise taxes on the property of the people without the consent of them or their deputies." It was not the plea of the politician alone. "I do not say," exclaimed the Boston clergyman Jonathan Mayhew, "our invaluable rights have been struck at; but if they have, they are not wrested from us," (1762.)

English dominion.

It was amidst these controversies that the French were conquered, and the English dominion rose to its height in America. In the north, it extended over the three provinces of St. John's, or Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, and Quebec, the new name for Canada. In the centre, it embraced the thirteen colonies, in which had lain the germ of its present growth. In the south, it comprehended the two provinces of East and West Florida, together with a large portion of the West Indies. So vast an empire overtopped all other dominions in the western world.

Effects on the colonies.

And now, to mark the effects of the victories upon the victors. First, upon the colonists. They had passed through agonizing times, when losses of friends and of resources weighed upon almost every household, when alternations of grief and of revenge racked almost every breast. As a community, likewise, each colony had met its trials and its reverses. Notwithstanding the reimbursements received from England, the colonies were in debt to the amount of more than ten million dollars, one quarter of which stood against Massachusetts alone, at the expiration of the last war with France. Debts, however, were nothing compared to the diminution of the means of paying them, or of gathering new resources. The sacrifices of warfare are not to be measured by any single schedule; roll after roll must be inscribed with losses, and even then the losses of the future, if they can be calculated, remain to be appended. On the other hand, the colonists were not without their compensations. They had rid themselves of an enemy whose neighborhood had been a constant source of peril, both from French and from Indian warfare, for a century and a half, (1613–1763.) They had proved their strength in repeated efforts and repeated successes. Better still, they had proved their union amongst themselves, especially in the final conflict which brought every colony of the thirteen shoulder to shoulder. Best of all, they had proved their patriotism, their love of their own land, hitherto overpowered by the affections that bound them to the other side of the sea, but now rising in solemn strength from out the battles and the agonies by which they had defended their country, and made it the first object of their devotion.

Upon the mother country.

Next, to trace the effects of victory upon the mother country. Here we find the marks of sorrow and of calamity, but they are lost in the blaze

of glory which seemed to have been kindled. "England," the king is said to have exclaimed, "never signed such a peace before." The king was George III., then in the third year of his reign. The aristocracy, still in power, thought with the king. They were dazzled by their success. It made them believe that their sway was irresistible, that their colonies were to be ruled, burdened, and crushed as they pleased. Only a few, of keener vision and of truer principle, saw that the conquest of the French colonies, if resulting in the issues to which it seemed to be leading, would entail the loss of the English colonies.

Temporary unity.

But for the moment, the English of England and the English of America were one. The exultation of triumph over a common foe, the assurance of prosperity under a common king, just risen in his youth to the throne, blended with the ties of a common law, a common literature, and a common ancestry. New hopes for both were appearing in the west. The Indian humbled, every race from Europe conquered, the English were the undisputed possessors of the far-stretching, the rich-promising land.

PART III.

THE INFANT NATION.

1763–1797.

CHAPTER I.

Provocations.

Old troubles extended.

The old troubles between the mother country and the colonies remained. They were now extended. To enforce the commercial rule of Great Britain, her fleet upon the American coast was turned into a revenue squadron. To keep up the military rule, the colonies were organized in divisions, with British commander-in-chief, British officers, and British troops, in short, a standing army. To maintain the whole system, commercial and military, the authorities of the mother country soon lent themselves to graver measures.

Parties in the mother country.

The great majority of the British people regarded the American colonists as countrymen, who could not suffer without their suffering, or prosper without their prospering. But the majority of the people was powerless, or comparatively so. The dominion over the mother country, as well as over her colonies, was with the aristocracy, with men who, whether liberal or not, — according to the phrase, — whether whig or tory, were of almost one and the same mind in regarding the colonists as their subjects. So thought the king, at this time the head of the aristocracy rather than the sovereign of the nation. So thought the Parliament, at this time the representative assembly of the aristocracy rather than of the nation. So thought the successive ministries, the common representatives of the king and of the Parliament, to whom

attached the credit or the discredit of any general course or of any particular measure that might be adopted in the councils of Great Britain. Thus it was but a portion of the nation — and this the smaller, although the more powerful portion — which was prepared to deal rigorously with the colonies.

Views of the colonies.

So the colonies perceived. If they had thanks to offer for occasional acts of liberality, they gave them to the nation, knowing that in any liberal measures the nation must be united. But if there were complaints to make, if there were outcries of indignation and agony to utter, the object of them was not the nation. The colonies knew that the nation, as a whole, was on their side, and that it was the king, the Parliament, or the ministry who alone, as a general rule, deserved reproach. Hence the emphasis upon the word *ministerial* in relation to the system upheld in Britain, and opposed in America.

Parties in the colonies.

The colonies themselves were not a unit. Even the old thirteen, with which we are concerned, presented by no means an unbroken front. The very number of their inhabitants — near two millions (1763) — implied differences and separations. A considerable part consisted of slaves and of servants scattered in varying proportions amongst the various colonies. Of the freemen themselves, a very considerable proportion was more accustomed to subjection than to independence. There were certainly many who were wholly unfit to defend their liberty, many more who were wholly unfit to raise it to a position of security. Happily there was a large and an increasing body of men, women, and children, whose natures and whose principles were of a higher stamp. On these the colonies relied as much against the weaknesses that were within, as against the oppressions that were without. The same class was prominent in the pre-

ceding period; here, more than ever, is it in the foreground.

The two sides.

Thus, then, in the story of the provocations dividing the mother country and the colonies, we have not England, not Great Britain, pitted against America, but the ruling class in the mother country opposed to the better class in the colonies. The distinction is important. Nothing else could explain the amount of blundering on one side, or the amount of wisdom, comparatively speaking, on the other. Nor could any thing else so clearly indicate the difference between the principles at stake — the principles of an old aristocracy on the one hand, and on the other those of a young commonalty, all fervent with vigor and with hope.

Ministries of the period.

The ministers representing the British side may be noted in this place. The Earl of Bute, prime minister at the beginning of the period, (1763,) was succeeded by George Grenville in the same year; then by the Marquis of Rockingham, (1765;) then by William Pitt, made Earl of Chatham, (1766;) then by the Duke of Grafton, (1768;) and then by Lord North, (1770.) The Rockingham and Chatham ministries alone were comparatively liberal, not even these being liberal in the true sense of the term.

Point of taxation.

England was laboring under the increased debts occasioned by the late war with France. It was not her part, argued the aristocracy, to bear them alone; they had been incurred, in a great degree, on account of the colonies, and the colonies should bear their share. The argument proceeded upon a strange forgetfulness of the fact that the colonies were already bearing their share, and more than their share, of debts and difficulties in consequence of the war. Not the less determined to increase the burdens of America, the authorities

in England cast about for the means of accomplishing their purpose. There was but one, and this taxation. Now, taxation of a certain sort was nothing new to the colonies. They had long borne with taxes for the so-called regulation of trade. But the ministry and their supporters, not content with the old taxes, were for raising new ones — taxes for revenue as well as for regulation of trade. Substantially, there was no difference; taxes were taxes, whether laid upon imports or upon any thing else; but the colonies were persuaded at the time, and for some time after, that there was a difference, and a vital one.

Discussion. When, therefore, Parliament voted, in the beginning of the year, (1764,) that it had "a right to tax the colonies," implying in any way whatever, the colonies took alarm. The Massachusetts House of Representatives ordered a committee of correspondence with the other colonies. James Otis, in a pamphlet on the Rights of the British Colonies, exclaimed, "that by this [the British] constitution, every man in the dominions is a free man; that no part of his majesty's dominions can be taxed without their consent." "The book," said Lord Mansfield, chief justice of the King's Bench, "is full of wildness." But it did not satisfy many of the colonists, and wilder still, as the chief justice would have said, became their assertions of independence. It was not long before the right of Parliament to lay any taxes whatsoever was discussed and denied.

Sugar act. But for the moment, the colonies were willing to bear with taxation under one name, provided it was not levied under another. The ministry, however, adopted the very style which the colonies disliked, and passed an act laying duties upon sugar and other articles of colonial import, with the expressed understanding that "it is just and necessary that a revenue be raised in America for defray-

ing the expenses of defending, protecting, and securing the same." In other words, both the commercial and the military sway over the colonies was to be supported and carried out by a course of taxation. Thus decided George Grenville and his party by the sugar act of 1764. It was a momentous decision.

Stamp act. The earnest remonstrances of the colonies, especially of New York and Rhode Island, produced no effect, except to precipitate measures in England. Ten months after the sugar act, a series of acts far more decisive was passed. A stamp act, proposed some time before, was enacted without any other serious opposition than that of English merchants in the American trade. By this act, all business papers and certificates, as well as newspapers, required a stamp, similar to that already used in Great Britain. At the same time, the jurisdiction of the Admiralty Court was extended, to the exclusion, therefore, of juries in many cases previously brought before them. Together with these new burdens upon the colonies, an old one was revived in the quartering act, by which quarters and various supplies were demanded from the colonies for the British troops amongst them. But neither the provisions for the troops nor those for the admiralty had any significance to be compared with the stamp duties, so unwonted and so unbearable, (1765.)

Resistance. They roused the colonies with a general start. "This unconstitutional method of taxation," was the comment of George Washington, who, for the last six years, had been a burgess of Virginia. "That parliamentary procedure," was the subsequent language of Jonathan Mayhew, of Boston, "which threatened us and our posterity with perpetual bondage and slavery." Virginia was the first to speak out, as a colony, in resolutions proposed by Patrick Henry. "Those Virginians," responded Oxen-

bridge Thacher, of Massachusetts, the associate of Otis in opposing the writs of assistance, — "those Virginians are men." The response of Massachusetts, as a colony, was the vote of her representatives, on the proposal of James Otis, that the colonies should be invited to send committees of their representatives or burgesses to meet at New York. South Carolina, led by Christopher Gadsden, was the first to appoint a committee to the proposed assembly.

Congress. The first congress of the colonies met on the 7th of October, 1765. South Carolina, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and Maryland sent committees of their respective assemblies, according to the original plan; the committees of New York, New Jersey, and Delaware being otherwise appointed. New Hampshire and Georgia, without sending committees, promised to adhere to the decisions of the congress. Virginia and North Carolina were absent and silent, but not from want of sympathy. Timothy Ruggles, of Massachusetts, an officer in the late war with France, was chosen president; amongst the members were James Otis and Christopher Gadsden, the two prime movers in the creation of the congress. Otis, like the other Massachusetts members, came instructed by the House of Representatives "to insist upon an exclusive right in the colony to all acts of taxation." This instruction sounds like the key note of the congress.

Declaration of rights and liberties. All other doings of the body, whether petition to king or addresses to Lords and Commons of Great Britain, sink into comparative insignificance by the side of a declaration of rights and liberties. This document, acknowledging the allegiance due by the colonies to the crown, dwells with peculiar emphasis upon their claim "to all the inherent rights and liberties of natural born subjects within the kingdom of Great Britain."

The rights especially demanded by the colonies are those of taxation by their own assemblies, and of trial by their own juries; the two, as will be remembered, assailed by the stamp act. The injustice and impolicy of the recent proceedings in the mother country are pointed out, with an earnest demand that all the obnoxious statutes should be at once repealed. The importance of the declaration must be evident. Preferring no claim to independence, it preferred claims to privileges which, in the existing relations between the colonies and the mother country, could not be secured without independence. The Declaration of Rights, dated the 19th of October, 1765, foretells the birth of the new nation as near at hand.*

* With the exception of a few lines in the preamble, here follows in full the

DECLARATION OF RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES.

The members of this congress esteem it our indispensable duty to make the following declaration of our humble opinion respecting the most essential rights and liberties of the colonists, and of the grievances under which they labor by reason of several late acts of Parliament.

I. That his majesty's subjects in these colonies owe the same allegiance to the crown of Great Britain that is owing from his subjects born within the realm, and all due subordination to that august body, the Parliament of Great Britain.

II. That his majesty's liege subjects in these colonies are entitled to all the inherent rights and liberties of his natural born subjects within the kingdom of Great Britain.

III. That it is inseparably essential to the freedom of a people, and the undoubted right of Englishmen, that no taxes be imposed on them but with their own consent, given personally or by their representatives.

IV. That the people of these colonies are not, and, from their local circumstances, cannot be represented in the House of Commons in Great Britain.

V. That the only representatives of the people of these colonies are persons chosen therein by themselves, and that no taxes ever have been or can be constitutionally imposed on them but by their respective legislatures.

VI. That all supplies to the crown being free gifts of the people, it is

Effect. The declaration was not made by every colony. But though signed by the representatives of only six colonies,* it was virtually the act of all but two, Virginia and North Carolina; and as such, it went forth to convince the mother country, nay, the colonies themselves,

unreasonable and inconsistent with the principles and spirit of the British constitution for the people of Great Britain to grant to his majesty the property of the colonists.

VII. That trial by jury is the inherent and invaluable right of every British subject in these colonies.

VIII. That the late act of Parliament entitled "An act for granting and applying certain stamp duties and other duties in the British colonies and plantations in America," &c., by imposing taxes on the inhabitants of these colonies, and the said act, and several other acts, by extending the jurisdiction of the Courts of Admiralty beyond its ancient limits, have a manifest tendency to subvert the rights and liberties of the colonists.

IX. That the duties imposed by several late acts of Parliament, from the peculiar circumstances of these colonies, will be extremely burdensome and grievous, and, from the scarcity of specie, the payment of them absolutely impracticable.

X. That as the profits of the trade of these colonies ultimately centre in Great Britain, to pay for the manufactures which they are obliged to take from thence, they eventually contribute very largely to all supplies granted there to the crown.

XI. That the restrictions imposed by several late acts of Parliament on the trade of these colonies will render them unable to purchase the manufactures of Great Britain.

XII. That the increase, prosperity, and happiness of these colonies depend on the full and free enjoyments of their rights and liberties, and an intercourse with Great Britain mutually affectionate and advantageous.

XIII. That it is the right of the British subjects in these colonies to petition the king or either House of Parliament.

Lastly. That it is the indispensable duty of these colonies, to the best of sovereigns, to the mother country, and to themselves, to endeavor by a loyal and dutiful address to his majesty, and humble applications to both Houses of Parliament, to procure the repeal of the act for granting and applying certain stamp duties, of all clauses of any other acts of Parliament whereby the jurisdiction of the admiralty is extended as aforesaid, and of the other late acts for the restriction of American commerce.

---

* Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, Maryland, New Jersey, and Delaware.

that they were no longer separate settlements, but a single country. So bold was the whole course of the congress, so startling the effect, in English eyes, that the Lord Chancellor Northington exclaimed, "I declare as a lawyer, they have forfeited all their charters." It was all done in a three weeks' session.

Riots.

Thus far the colonies appear to have met their provocations with all the composure of men who knew the right to be upon their side. But it was not always so. When one of the New Jersey representatives, who had declined signing the acts of the congress, returned home, he was hanged and burned in effigy by his constituents. The mob spirit had shown itself, months before, in Boston and in Providence, where effigies were paraded and houses sacked amidst violence the most abhorrent to all the better class of the townspeople. When the stamp act went into operation, just after the close of the congress, a great riot broke out in New York, although there, as elsewhere, not a stamp officer remained to execute the provisions of the act. It is wiser to pass by such things with regret than to pause over their details as if they were the deeds of heroes. They sprang from strong feelings, we must allow, but not from strong principles; and so far from aiding the colonies in obtaining justice, did more than any thing besides to increase the oppressiveness of the mother country. Bitterly, therefore, were they deplored by men like those who met in the congress or approved its acts of magnanimity. But such is ever the effect of oppression. It overturns the reason of the feeble; it overthrows the influence of the strong.

Non-importation and non-consumption.

The outbreak in New York led to one result of value. An agreement to suspend importations from Great Britain was fortified by the resolution to encourage manufactures at home, even by such means

as eating no lamb or mutton, so that there might be wool enough for the country. All this being communicated by a committee of correspondence to the other colonies, there ensued a general, though not a universal, abstinence from British goods. Non-importation and non-consumption became the watchwords of the colonies; and though broken again and again, they were again and again renewed during the ensuing years. The great change that resulted in the outward looks of society harmonized with the transformation of feelings which was going on every where.

Repeal of stamp act.

Meanwhile the want of stamp officers, and the indisposition of the colonial authorities to enforce the stamp act by themselves, had left it in a lifeless condition. Demands that it should be put out of existence altogether came, not from the colonies alone, but from a large number of merchants in England. Pitt and Burke, the greatest of English statesmen at the time, took up the opposition; and as the act had but augmented the expenditures of the kingdom without increasing its revenues,* the ministry, then professing to be a liberal one, listened to the general clamor for repeal. Amidst the throngs of tradesmen and merchants, politicians and statesmen, discussing the question, we see the colonial agents all alive to the interests with which they were charged. Foremost stood Benjamin Franklin, for several years † the agent of Pennsylvania, and now called before the House of Commons, where he assured his questioners that the colonies would never submit to the stamp act, nor to any similar statute, however much they might yield upon the point of duties to regulate commerce. The repeal was carried, accom-

* It had cost the treasury £12,000, of which but little more than a twelfth part was returned from duties levied in Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Quebec, Florida, and the West Indies.

† Since 1767, but with an interval.

panied, however, by a declaratory act, "for the better securing the dependency of his majesty's dominions in America upon the crown and Parliament of Great Britain in all cases whatsoever." This was the answer of England to the congress of America; the stamp act was laid aside; but the power of taxation was more tightly grasped than ever.

American rejoicings.

It was now the spring of 1766. And never had that season been so full of bloom as in the gladness which it now brought to the colonies. The fact that their rejoicings over the repeal of the stamp act were unmingled with any apparent misgivings as to the purpose of the declaratory act, shows the warmth of their attachment to the mother country. Statues to Pitt and to the king, with indemnities to those who had suffered from the riots of the preceding year, were voted amidst a turbulence of congratulation such as no event had ever occasioned in America.

New acts.

Forebodings returned with the following year. The Parliament of 1767 created a board of revenue commissioners for America; passed a tea act, by which duties were imposed upon tea and other imports into the colonies, for the purpose not only of providing for troops as before, but of securing fixed salaries for the royal governors and the royal judges; then pronounced the New York assembly incapable of legislation until the quartering act of 1765 was obeyed by that body, hitherto resisting its execution. Here were three measures more comprehensive and more oppressive than any parliamentary legislation had as yet been.

Resistance again.

They were met as might have been expected. "Let us complain to our parent," wrote John Dickinson, a native of Maryland, and a representative of Pennsylvania, in his Letters from a Farmer, "but let our complaints speak at the same time the language of affliction

and veneration," (1767.) The beginning of the next year (1768) brought out the sterner voice of Massachusetts through her representatives, inveighing against all the enactments of Parliament, and calling upon the colonies to join in one firm front of resistance. This measure the next house was called upon to rescind, and by no less an authority than that of the ministry; but in vain. The same spirit showed itself in all classes. The students of Harvard College declared the proceedings of their tutors unconstitutional, and called a tree by the name of Liberty. The Boston Cadets — a volunteer guard of the governor — refused to appear if the revenue commissioners, who had their head quarters at Boston, were invited to join a procession. The commissioners were soon flying from a riot occasioned by the seizure of John Hancock's sloop for a fraudulent entry at the custom house. Such was the prevailing confusion, that British troops were ordered to the town, (1768.)

Massachusetts convention.

This was too much for Boston. A town meeting called upon the governor to convene the General Court. On his refusal, the meeting advised the people to get their arms ready, on account, it was said, "of an approaching war with France;" then summoned a convention from all Massachusetts. This gathered, and again requested the governor to summon the legislature. He again refused, and hinted at treason in the convention, with reason, indeed, considering the entire novelty of such a body to him and to the colony. The convention, not very full of fire, deprecated the displeasure of the governor, and addressed a petition to the king. Just as the convention was separating, the troops arrived, but without finding the quarters that were demanded for them from Boston, sturdier as a town than Massachusetts as a colony. "O my countrymen!" exclaimed Josiah Quincy, Jr., one of the truest-hearted young men of Boston; "what will our children say

when they read the history of these times, should they find we tamely gave away, without one noble struggle, the most invaluable of earthly blessings?" This was no appeal to violence. "To banish folly and luxury," continued the Christian patriot, "correct vice and immorality, and stand immovable in the freedom in which we are free indeed, is eminently the duty of each individual at this day," (1768.)

Act concerning trials in England.

The new year (1769) began with a new provocation, in the shape of an act directing that all cases of treason, whether occurring in the colonies or not, should be tried in the mother country. This was worse than any taxation, worse than any extension of admiralty courts, any demand for quarters, any creation of revenue commissioners, any suspension of assemblies; it struck a blow at the safety of the person as well as the freedom of the subject. The planter at Mount Vernon, hitherto calm, exclaims with indignation that "our lordly masters in Great Britain will be satisfied with nothing less than the deprivation of American freedom." "That no man," he writes, "should scruple or hesitate a moment to use arms in defence of so valuable a blessing, is clearly my opinion. Yet arms, I would beg leave to add, should be the last resource." The Virginia assembly, of which Washington was still a member, passed resolutions of kindred spirit. Massachusetts was more than ready to follow. The Suffolk grand jury indicted the governor of Massachusetts, the commander-in-chief of the colonies in general, with the revenue commissioners and officers of the customs, for libelling the province to the ministry. Joseph Hawley, representative from Northampton, declared in the house that he knew not "how Parliament could have acquired a right of legislation over the colonies." Thus for every fresh provocation was there a fresh resistance, denying more and more of the power that was more and more oppressive.

Colonial divisions. The New York assembly now made its submission to the quartering act. In doing so it gave great offence to many of the people, one of whom was thrown into prison for his violent denunciation of the assembly. Neither he nor the assembly showed much wisdom in thus contending at a time when union was so much required. But there were parties amongst the colonists, just as there had been, indeed, from the beginning, but now more distinctly marked and more widely separated. No less than five divisions existed, the central and the most substantial being that of the class already mentioned as chief in the colonies. This was flanked, on one side, by two orders more or less inclined to submit to the mother country, and on the other side by two orders more or less inclined to defy the mother country. To begin with the royalists, their name explaining itself; then came the neutrals, as they may be styled, neither precisely royalist nor precisely colonist; next the colonists proper, in their close and resolute ranks — the men on whom the issue depended more than on any others; and after them the more excited parties, first of the Sons of Liberty, as they called themselves,* and second of the rioters. Thus, with royalists and neutrals on one wing, and with Sons of Liberty and rioters on the other, the main body of the colonists had but a weary and an anxious march.

Boston massacre. The difficulties of the case were nowhere more apparent than in Boston. A constant tendency to riot on the part of a portion of the townspeople required as much energy on the part of the better class as any provocations from abroad against which they were contending. While the wiser Bostonians were endeavoring to procure

* From the words of Barré's famous speech of 1765. Many of the original Sons of Liberty were of the class described as the better one of the time; but, at the present period, the order was made up of the more turbulent spirits, yet not the most turbulent of all.

the withdrawal of the troops quartered amongst them, a party of men and boys involved themselves in a quarrel with the soldiers, the end of which was blood. This Boston Massacre, as it was called, did but add to the burden of the moderate and the effective citizens. The soldiers who had fired upon the people required to be defended upon a charge of murder; the authorities in England required to be convinced that the violence of the populace was as much deplored as the musketry of the soldiery. It marks the increasing passions of the times, that the two advocates retained by the English officer in command on the night of the affray, though they were no less tried patriots than John Adams and Josiah Quincy, Jr., should have fallen under censure for undertaking the defence. Happily for the fame of Boston, they secured the safety of the accused, only two out of nine being brought in guilty, and those of manslaughter alone, for which they were branded in the hand and then discharged, (1770.)

Other disturbances.

Boston was not alone in these disturbances. North Carolina saw a large portion of her interior settlers banded together as Regulators * against the colonial government; nor were they brought to reason without a battle, in which they were defeated by a volunteer force from the orderly portion of the colony, (1771.) In the north, again, the burning of storehouses at Portsmouth, and the destruction of the revenue schooner Gaspe in Narraganset Bay, kept up the flames of rashness and of outrage, (1772.) The Gaspe, or its officers, however, had done all that was possible to provoke its doom.

The mother country had been pursuing a comparatively gentle course. The repeal of the duty upon many arti-

* A name first applied in South Carolina to a party undertaking to execute the laws for themselves; in modern phrase, Lynch-law men.

cles imported into the colonies showed a disposition to conciliate, (1770.) Two years passed before any act appeared in relation to the colonies; nor could that then enacted be called a provocation. In consequence of the occurrence at Portsmouth, a bill passed Parliament to secure the trial in England of any incendiaries of the royal stores or ships in America, (1772.) It did not please the colonists, not even the great party of moderation, to think that they had brought this sentence upon themselves. The truth was, that the less moderate the course of things, the fewer moderate men there were to bring things back to moderation. What was done only by the violent was upheld in many instances by the prudent; a common sympathy was fast fusing all parties. So Boston now held its town meeting, and put forth its memorial not only against the acts of which it had to complain, but against those which it seemed to have to apprehend.

Additional act concerning trials.

The next year showed how fast the colonies were driving on. It began with resolutions from Virginia, where a committee was appointed to correspond with the other colonies. To the closer union thus proposed, Rhode Island was the first to adhere, but without immediate results. Yet, as the year advanced, the colonists found themselves the better prepared to combine in resistance to the introduction of large quantities of tea, still subject to duty. It was the plan partly of the East India Company and partly of the ministry; the former hoping to dispose of their swollen stock, the latter to obtain some of the taxes that appeared to have been levied in vain upon the colonies. Philadelphia was the first to take the field by town meeting against tea and taxation. Boston soon followed; and when the proceedings of town meetings, both ordinary and extraordinary, came to nought, as the governor stood fast for the East India Company and the ministry,

Tea destroyed in Boston.

the three vessels that had come in with tea were boarded, and their cargoes thrown into the dock. It was a sad event for many even of the more resolute citizens; but the majority, under the lead of Samuel Adams, was now composed of the rash as well as the resolute; a party from the country having been most active in the destruction of the tea, (December, 1773.) A few weeks later, a smaller quantity of tea, imported to private order, was also destroyed at Boston, (February, 1774.)

And elsewhere. The same thing happened at New York and Annapolis. But the larger portion of the tea received at New York, and all received at Philadelphia, was swiftly returned to England. This returning the tea, or the storing it where it would soon lose its virtue, as in Charleston, was a far wiser course than destroying it. The process of destruction was also the less bold. It was effected by men disguised, or else so maddened as to scorn disguise.

Slave trade. It has already appeared how small a part of the provocations to the colonies consisted in mere measures of taxation. A signal instance of the comprehensive inflictions from the mother country came up in the midst of the transactions lately occurred. The repugnance of the colonies to the slave trade, reviving in these times of struggle, brought out renewed expressions of opposition and abhorrence. Virginia attempted by her assembly to lay restrictions on the traffic; but the royal governor was at once directed by the authorities at home to consent to no laws affecting the interests of the slave dealers, (1770.) The efforts of other colonies met with similar obstacles. Bills of assemblies, petitions to the king, called forth by the startling development of the trade,* were alike ineffect-

* In less than nine months, 6431 slaves were imported into the single colony of South Carolina, from Africa and the West Indies.

ual. "It is the opinion of this meeting," — thus ran the resolves of the county of Fairfax, George Washington chairman, — "that during our present difficulties and distress, no slaves ought to be imported into any of the British colonies on this continent; and we take this opportunity of declaring our most earnest wishes to see an entire stop forever put to such a wicked, cruel, and unnatural trade," (1774.)

Chastisement of Massachusetts and Boston.

Provocations were gathering heavily and rapidly. Massachusetts and Boston, foremost in the tea troubles, and, soon after, in the disturbances occasioned by royal salaries to the governors and judges of the colonies, were singled out for peculiar chastisement. The Boston port bill closed the harbor of that town to all importation and exportation. Then General Gage, commander-in-chief of the British forces in the colonies, was appointed governor of Massachusetts. Not content with creating this state of siege, the ministry brought in a bill for the better regulating the government of Massachusetts Bay, by which the colony was virtually deprived of its charter. The councillors and superior judges were all to be appointed by the crown; the inferior judges and other officers being left to the nomination of the governor, who was invested with a sort of absolute authority. No town meetings were to be held, except for elections, unless the governor saw fit to make any further exceptions. No juries were to be summoned, except by the sheriffs, that is, by the officers of the governor. To crown the whole, a third bill provided that persons charged with murder in sustaining the government, should be sent to another colony or to England for trial — a shrewd precaution, considering the certainty of collision between the people and the government under the system about to be enforced. Such were the measures by which Massachusetts was to be crushed and her sister colonies overawed. The crisis had come with the spring and summer of 1774.

Quebec act.

Another proceeding of the same period was intended to separate the thirteen colonies from their neighbors on the continent. The French settlers in the west had shown some signs of sympathy with the English colonies, not, indeed, by any direct coöperation, or even intercourse, but by the same irrepressible instincts after liberty. When their petition for a form of government in which they could have some share was met by a system in which none but the royal officials had any part, the French in the Illinois country protested against it with all the fervor of their nature, (1773.) To keep such spirits down, especially to keep them from combining with the kindred spirits of the English colonies, seems to have been the main object of the Quebec act, by which that province, extended from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the Mississippi, was placed under a government mostly of royal officials. At the same time, the French were conciliated by the restoration of their law and of their church, (1774.)

Conventions and Provincial Congress in Massachusetts.

Thus cut off from their northern and western neighbors, the inhabitants of the thirteen colonies gathered together against the mother-land. A circular from Boston to the towns of Massachusetts called upon them to make common resistance to the recent acts. Several of the towns, or rather counties, met by delegates in convention at Boston to resolve upon measures of defence, amongst which "the military art" and "a Provincial Congress" were prominent. A convention of Middlesex county at Concord resolved that "to obey them," that is, the acts of Parliament, "would be to annihilate the last vestiges of liberty in this province," (August.) Ten days after, (September,) a convention of Suffolk county at Milton recommended that the detested acts "should be rejected as the attempts of a wicked administration to enslave America." The next month, (October,)

the House of Representatives voted itself a Provincial Congress. This was decisive. But that it was done, must be ascribed not merely to the inherent independence of Massachusetts, but to the pervading sympathy of the sister colonies.

National spirit.

"Has not this," wrote Washington, nearly three months before, in relation to the acts of Parliament and the proceedings of Governor General Gage,—"has not this exhibited an unexampled testimony of the most despotic system of tyranny that was ever practised in a free government? . . . Shall we supinely sit, and see one province after another fall a sacrifice to despotism? . . . My nature recoils at the thought of submitting to measures which I think subversive of every thing that I ought to hold dear and valuable." Such was the tone of every true voice, the feeling of every true heart. A national spirit was aroused.

Continental Congress.

More than a year previously, Benjamin Franklin —now agent not only for Pennsylvania, but for Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Georgia — wrote officially to the Massachusetts House of Representatives, recommending a General Congress, (1773.) But it was not until ten months afterwards that the project was taken up, and then not in Massachusetts, but in Rhode Island. Virginia followed close, recommending that the Congress should be annual, and voting that "an attack upon one colony was an attack upon all British America," (May, 1774.) Rhode Island was the first to appoint delegates; Massachusetts doing the same almost immediately, and the other colonies, Georgia excepted, imitating these examples. The method of appointment varied from choice by the assembly, or by a convention of the whole colony, to choice by committees, county and town, or by a single committee. It was a noble body that met at Philadelphia on the 5th of September.

1774. Samuel Adams and John Adams were there from Massachusetts; John Jay from New York; John Dickinson from Pennsylvania; George Washington, Patrick Henry, and Richard Henry Lee, from Virginia; Christopher Gadsden and John Rutledge from South Carolina. "If you speak of eloquence," said Patrick Henry, on being asked about the greatest man in Congress, "Mr. Rutledge is by far the greatest orator; but if you speak of solid information and sound judgment, Colonel Washington is unquestionably the greatest man on that floor." It needed all that the leaders, all that the members as a body, could command, to meet the exigencies of the time. The Congress that met to reject the stamp act, nine years before, had but child's play to go through, compared with the work of the present Congress — the Continental Congress, as it was called.

Its work.

Taxation had been the substance of three acts of Parliament, or, at the most, of four.* There were twice or thrice that number † upon other points to be opposed. Against all these provocations the Continental Congress put forth their declaration of colonial rights. In this, much the same ground as to the allegiance and the general rights of the colonies was taken as had been held by the earlier Congress. It is therefore a document of secondary importance in the progress of our history.

American Association.

Not so the American Association. This was a body of articles, by which a stop was to be put, after certain dates, to all importation from or exportation

* The sugar, the stamp, and the tea acts, with the act creating revenue commissioners.

† The quartering acts, the act suspending the New York assembly, the acts concerning trials for treason and incendiarism, the three acts against Massachusetts, the Quebec act, besides those portions of the stamp and tea acts relating to Admiralty Courts and royal salaries.

to Great Britain and its dependencies, so long as the oppressive acts of Parliament were not repealed. "We will neither import nor purchase any slaves imported after the first day of December next," was one of the articles; "after which time we will neither be concerned in it ourselves, nor will we hire our vessels, nor sell our commodities or manufactures, to those who are concerned in it." Thus humane as well as bold, considerate for their inferiors as well as resolute towards their superiors, or those claiming to be such, the members of the Continental Congress signed the American Association. The date was October 20, 1774. It was the birthday of the nation.

Petition and addresses.

Together with the Association and the declaration, there came from Congress a petition to the king and addresses to the people of Great Britain, British America, and Canada, besides letters to Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, and the two Floridas. These various documents being adopted, and the debates on all the stirring questions of the time being concluded, not altogether with unanimity, Congress separated, (October 26,) having provided that another Congress should be convened, if necessary, in the ensuing spring.

Peace or war.

"More blood," wrote Washington, during the session of Congress, "will be spilled on this occasion, if the ministry are determined to push matters to extremity, than history has ever yet furnished instances of in the annals of North America." "After all," wrote Joseph Hawley from Massachusetts to John Adams in Congress,—"after all, we must fight." Adams read the letter to his colleague from Virginia, the fervid Patrick Henry, who burst out with the exclamation, "I am of that man's mind!" It was not the opinion of every one. Richard Henry Lee parted from Adams with the assurance that "all the offensive acts will be repealed. . . . Britain will give up her foolish project."

Preparation. Come peace or come war, the Americans, as they are hereafter to be called, were prepared. Not, it is true, with armies or fortresses, not with the material resources which they seemed to require, but with the spirit that was of far greater importance, the source of all outward strength and success. This spirit was not without its supports, intellectual or physical. The struggles with the mother country had called out orators and statesmen, whose minds were daily making some fresh contribution to the thought and the power of humanity. Physically, the Americans were increasing their stores and extending their domains. The road to the great west was opened with the first settlement made in the present Tennessee, (1768.) If old weaknesses lingered, if the disputes between colony and colony continued, now on a question of boundary, now on one of doctrine, they were lost in the union that had been achieved, in the nation that had been born.

CHAPTER II.

War.

Arming of Massachusetts.

The very day that the Continental Congress separated, — October 26, 1774, — the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts took a step decisive of war. This was the organization of the militia, consisting of all the able-bodied men of the colony, one fourth of them being constituted minute men, bound to take up arms at a minute's warning. Soon afterwards, provision was made for supplying the equipments and munitions of an army. The whole was placed under the direction of a committee of safety, with John Hancock for a chairman.

Not unprovoked or unanticipated.

The arming of the colony had not been unprovoked. Two months before, General Gage, the commander-in-chief and the governor, had begun to fortify the land approach to Boston. He had also seized upon some stores of powder belonging to the province at Charlestown. Such was the temper excited against him, that Christopher Gadsden, the representative of South Carolina in the Continental Congress, proposed an immediate attack upon the British head quarters in Boston. Neither was the arming of Massachusetts altogether unanticipated. No colony, indeed, had gone so far; but many a town, many a band of individuals, was prepared for conflict. A rumor that Boston was bombarded by the British brought out numbers of the Connecticut militia to the rescue of their countrymen. Years before, when the stamp

act was rousing the land to resistance, some ardent New Yorkers had voted "to march with all despatch . . . to the relief of those who should or might be in danger from the stamp act or its abettors," (1765.) The juncture thus prepared for arrived when Massachusetts armed herself. From that day, war was inevitable. The British authorities would never sit by while such things were going on, nor could they attempt any measures of repression without arousing the colonists to use the weapons which they had assumed.

Arming of other colonies.

The example of Massachusetts was soon followed. Far and near, the colonies, by act of assembly, or of convention, or of individual resolution, took up the posture of defence. All the while, the national spirit was sustained by the American Association, and by the committees appointed to enforce it. Though not universally prevalent, the Association had extended itself more widely and more deeply than any previous bond of union amongst the colonies. Earnest to maintain their ties and their rights, the Americans drew out their lines. It was no great show in a military point of view. In point of courage, of sacrifice, it was sublime.

Course of Parliament.

The year was closing in England with a new Parliament, in which the majorities for the ministry were irresistible. Amongst the members was a native of New York, Henry Cruger, who, having settled as a merchant at Bristol, was elected mayor, and returned to Parliament. In the prime of manhood, flushed with generous emotion for the country of his birth, although opposed to its revolutionary courses, he rose to make his maiden speech against the severities with which the ministry was threatening America. "Can it be believed," he cries, "that Americans will be dragooned into a conviction of this right of parliamentary taxation?" The plea was

taken up by men of greater influence. As the new year (1775) opened, Chatham and Burke devoted themselves to obtaining justice for America. In vain; the petition of the Continental Congress to the king was refused a hearing; rebellion was declared to exist in Massachusetts, and to be abetted by other colonies. The "New England restraining act" cut off the New England colonies from the fishery and from all trade, save to Great Britain, Ireland, and the British West Indies. The prohibition was soon extended to the other colonies; New York, North Carolina, and Georgia being spared on account of their expected submission. At the same time, Lord North, the prime minister, brought out what he called a conciliatory proposition, to the effect that the colonies should not be taxed by Parliament, if they would tax themselves, and therewith raise the sums which Parliament should deem necessary. "They complain," was the decisive reply of Edmund Burke, "that they are taxed without their consent; you answer that you will fix the sum at which they shall be taxed. That is, you give them the very grievance for the remedy." The proposition, thus clearly seen through by an Englishman, was not likely to blind Americans. Out of Parliament, there were few to take any active part in relation to America. We should not, however, pass over the suggestion of Dr. Tucker, Dean of Gloucester, that Parliament should declare the colonies separated from the mother country until they humbled themselves to ask for forgiveness and for restoration. Had the dean's idea been adopted, how much wrong, how much blood, might have been saved!

First collision.

But the Americans and the British were now to meet in arms. A party of one hundred and fifty troops, sent from Boston to seize some cannon at Salem, not finding it there, marched on towards Danvers. On their way, they came to a bridge, occupied at first by a few coun-

try people, but presently by a company of militia under Colonel Pickering. As the draw was up, the British attempted to cross the stream in boats, and in doing so, used their bayonets freely enough to wound the men who kept the boats from them. A serious conflict would have ensued but for the mediation of Mr. Barnard, a clergyman of Salem, who prevailed on the British officer, Lieutenant Colonel Leslie, to return in case the troops were allowed to cross the bridge. This was agreed to on the American side; the troops crossed, advanced a few rods, then faced about, and retired without the cannon of which they had come in search. The date was February 26, 1775.

Its significance.

The collision is memorable as the first of the war. It is also to be remarked as strikingly significant of the collisions that followed. The same paucity of numbers, the same restriction of movements, the same ineffectiveness of results, characterize the whole strife between Great Britain and America. We must be prepared for operations on a small scale, and with a small effect, each taken alone. Taken together, however, the operations of the war bear a nearer proportion to the greatness of the stakes at issue.

Lexington and Concord.

The next encounter was more serious. It took place in the early morning of April 19. A force of eight hundred troops, marching from Boston to Concord, for the purpose of destroying the military stores collected in that place, met not quite a hundred minute men at Lexington. The British fired; the minute men returned the fire, but, of course, retreated, leaving a few of their number killed and wounded. The men of Concord retired before the troops without attempting resistance; but from the surrounding towns there came other minute men so numerous and so spirited as to engage with the British, and compel them to retreat. The retreat became a flight;

nor would the fugitives have escaped but for the reënforcements which met them at Lexington. The number of the Americans being also on the increase, the retreat, resumed at Lexington, proved very difficult. Had it been protracted, the arrival of fresh parties of minute men would have cut it off altogether. As it was, the British, out of seventeen hundred troops, lost nearly three hundred in killed, wounded, and prisoners. The Americans, amounting in all to several hundred, lost less than one hundred.

Effect. Mecklenburg declaration.

"An inhuman soldiery," wrote Joseph Warren, president of the Provincial Congress, to the committees of safety throughout Massachusetts, "enraged at being repulsed from the field of slaughter, will, without the least doubt, take the first opportunity in their power to ravage this devoted country with fire and sword. We conjure you, therefore, that you give all assistance possible in forming an army." Massachusetts voted that at least thirty thousand men ought to be raised by New England, herself furnishing nearly half the number. Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New Hampshire soon responded, but not quite so liberally as the sister colony had desired. Out of New England, the agitation was the same. "The once happy and peaceful plains of America," wrote Washington from Philadelphia, "are either to be drenched with blood or inhabited by slaves. Sad alternative! But can a virtuous man hesitate in his choice?" The news, travelling slowly, reached the town of Charlotte, Mecklenburg county, North Carolina, where a county convention was in session. It lent resolution to the delegates, who soon declared their independence of "the authority of the king and Parliament . . . and the former civil constitution of these colonies,"* (May.) The declaration of

* Two sets of resolutions exist, one much stronger than the other, but both equally strong upon the point of independence. The dates likewise vary, but both profess to have been adopted in the latter half of May, 1775.

Mecklenburg county was communicated to the Provincial Congress of the colony, without, however, obtaining the sympathy of that assembly. It was also forwarded to the North Carolina representatives in the Continental Congress; but so little did it move them, that they did not even lay it before their colleagues.

War in Massachusetts.

The troops of New England were gathering about Boston. The people of Massachusetts sent an address to the people of Great Britain. "Appealing to Heaven," they declared, "for the justice of our cause, we determine to die or to be free." Repelling a Connecticut offer of mediation between herself and her governor, General Gage, Massachusetts voted him "an unnatural and inveterate enemy" — a compliment which he afterwards returned by pronouncing the Massachusetts people "rebels and traitors." The breach yawned wide, and wider still, as the passions and the outrages of war poured in.

Ticonderoga and Crown Point.

So far the Americans had acted on the defensive. But now a band of volunteers from Connecticut and the Green Mountains, led by Ethan Allen and Seth Warner, with whom went Benedict Arnold, under a Massachusetts commission, surprised the small garrisons at Ticonderoga and Crown Point, (May 10–12.) Descending thence against various places on Lake Champlain, the adventurous band secured a large booty, and then separated, leaving a considerable portion of their number in possession of the Point and Ticonderoga.

Proceedings in Congress.

The spirit aroused in action appeared in deliberation likewise. When the new Congress assembled at Philadelphia in the spring, (May 10,) it began upon measures more determined by far than those of the former body. The members were mostly the same; but the circumstances in which they met were as different as

peace and war. Massachusetts opened the way to new resolutions, by recommending the creation of an American army, and by asking instruction as to the form of government under which she should place herself. Congress answered the request by advising the election of a council and an assembly, who should administer the colony by themselves, until a governor should appear to take his part according to the charter of 1691. Soon afterwards, the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts gave way to a General Court or assembly. The recommendation of an army was followed by Congress in adopting the troops before Boston as the American continental army. To this were also summoned a few companies of riflemen from the southern colonies.

Washington appointed commander-in-chief.

The creation of an army required the creation of a commander. No act of Congress could be more important, none proved more successful, than the appointment of Colonel George Washington, representative from Virginia. "We, the delegates of the United Colonies," — thus runs the commission of Washington, — "reposing special trust and confidence in your patriotism, conduct, and fidelity, do by these presents constitute and appoint you to be general and commander-in-chief of the army of the United Colonies. . . . And you are hereby vested with full power and authority to act as you shall think for the good and welfare of the service." Rapid as these outlines of events must be, they will bear repeated testimony to the unequalled, indeed the hitherto unconceived devotion of Washington to the cause of his country. His acceptance of the commission. itself the greatest act of sacrifice that he could make, was accompanied by the refusal of all pecuniary compensation for his services. It was a memorable day when this devoted career began — June 15, 1775.

Bunker Hill. As if to do honor to the general thus given them, the New England troops, just declared the continental army, furnished a detachment of one thousand, under Colonel Prescott, to take possession of Bunker's Hill, a point of great importance to the lines around Boston. He, through a mistake assisted by the ardor of his character, threw up his redoubt upon Breed's Hill, an eminence considerably nearer to the town. Reënforced by a thousand men, the party completed their fortifications in time to receive the three thousand British troops assailing them from Boston. Twice was the advance of the enemy repelled; but the failure of ammunition obliged the Americans to retreat, leaving one of their most heroic hearts, President and Major General Joseph Warren, dead upon the field. Four hundred and fifty of them in all were killed or wounded; the British losing more than twice that number. The battle of Bunker Hill, as it was afterwards called, has been greatly magnified beyond the importance attached to it at the time. But there can be no question of its having done much to mortify the British, who had always boasted that the Americans would fly before them, as well as much to elate the Americans, although they had always boasted that they would resist their foes, (June 17.)

Washington at the head of the army Washington heard of the battle at New York, on his way to the army. Hastening his journey, he arrived at Cambridge, which was to be his head quarters, and assumed the command. On the next day, July 4, he issued an order to the forces. "The Continental Congress," he proclaimed, "having now taken all the troops of the several colonies, which have been raised or which may be hereafter raised for the support and defence of the liberties of America, into their pay and service, they are now the troops of the United Provinces of North America; and it is hoped that all distinctions of colonies

will be laid aside, so that one and the same spirit may animate the whole. . . . The general requires and expects of all officers, not engaged on actual duty, a punctual attendance on divine service, to implore the blessings of Heaven upon the means used for our safety and defence." Thus appealing to the love of country and to the fear of God, Washington called upon his countrymen to do their duty in the war.

Difficulties. Not every one was disposed to hear him. Indeed, there were but few who came up to the standard of their chief, either as soldiers or as men. When we read of their deficiencies and of his embarrassments, we must remember that he and those like him were the representatives of the better class of Americans, already described as most prominent and most wise during the struggles of the preceding years. They, on the other hand, who fell short of the demands upon them, were of the other classes, the rash or the timid, the too presumptuous or the too submissive.

Siege of Boston. Washington at once determined to lay regular siege to Boston. His first object was merely to shut up the British in the town, (July.) Presently, he tried to bring on an attack from the enemy against the American lines, (August.) This failing, he formed the purpose of attacking the British in their own lines, (September.) He deferred to the objections of his officers, and put off the assault, without, however, abandoning his designs. All the while, he had no arms, no ammunition, no pay for his troops from Congress; no general support from his officers or men; no obedience even, at times, from the soldiers or from the crews of the armed vessels acting in concert with the army. It was very difficult to fill the ranks to any degree at all proportioned to the operations of the siege. "There must be some other stimulus," he writes to the

president of Congress, "besides love for their country, to make men fond of the service." "Such a dearth of public spirit," he laments to a personal friend, "and such want of virtue, such stockjobbing and fertility to obtain advantages of one kind and another, I never saw before, and pray God's mercy that I may never be witness to again. . . . I tremble at the prospect. . . . Could I have foreseen what I have experienced and am likely to experience, no consideration upon earth should have induced me to accept this command." Such were the circumstances, and such the feelings, in which the commander-in-chief found himself conducting the great operation of the year.

General government.

By this time there was not only an army, but a government of America. The Continental Congress, declaring themselves to be acting "in defence of the freedom that is our birthright," took all the measures, military, financial, and diplomatic, which the cause appeared to require. The organization of the army was continued; that of the militia was attempted. A naval committee was appointed, and a navy — if the name can be used on so small a scale — was called into existence. Hospitals were provided. Several millions of continental currency were issued, and a treasury department created. A post office was also organized. Several of the colonies who had applied for advice upon the point were recommended to frame governments for themselves. The Indian relations were reduced to system. A last petition to the king, with addresses to Great Britain and London, Ireland and Jamaica, was adopted. More significant than all else was the appointment of a committee of secret correspondence with Europe. In short, the functions of a general government were assumed by Congress and recognized throughout the colonies.

At the beginning of August, Georgia signified her acces-

The thirteen complete.

sion to the other colonies, thus completing the thirteen. A fourteenth offered itself in Transylvania, the present Kentucky, where one or two small settlements had just been made. But Congress could not admit the delegate of a territory which Virginia claimed as under her jurisdiction. The nation and the government remained as the Thirteen United Colonies.

Military operations.

Military operations, apart from the siege of Boston, were numerous, if not extensive. The landing of a British party at Gloucester was repelled. The fort near Charleston was seized by the Americans, who also drove the British ships out of the harbor. Norfolk, for some time in the hands of the British, was recovered after a gallant action. On the other hand, Stonington, Bristol, and Falmouth were not saved from bombardment, Falmouth (now Portland) being nearly annihilated. The Americans, in return, sent out their privateers; those commissioned by Washington, especially his "famous Manly," as he called one of his captains, doing great execution in Massachusetts Bay. Offensive operations were pursued on land. A projected expedition against Nova Scotia was given up, chiefly on account of the friendly feeling of that province. But a twofold force, partly from the New York and partly from the Maine side, marched against Canada. St. John's and Montreal were taken by the Americans under General Montgomery, who fell in an assault on Quebec the last day of the year. Arnold, the same who had gone against Crown Point and Ticonderoga, kept up the show of besieging Quebec through the winter, but in the spring the Americans retreated within their own borders. One of the most successful operations of the period was towards the close of winter, when fifteen hundred Highlanders and Regulators, who had enlisted under the royal banner in North Carolina, were defeated by two thirds their number of

Americans, under Colonel Moore. It saved the province to the country.

Loyalists. The mention of those enlisted in the royal cause suggests the increasing divisions amongst the Americans. A large number, who had looked on or even joined in the proceedings of former days, drew off, if they did not take a hostile position, in these days of war. Companies and regiments of royal or loyal Americans began to abound. Some of these loyalists, as they were styled, were roughly handled by their indignant neighbors, who spared neither person nor property. One of the New York Sons of Liberty, Isaac Sears, impatient at the moderate course pursued by the committee of safety, brought in an armed band from Connecticut, to destroy the press of Rivington's Gazetteer, a journal in the British interest. Such doings were more likely to introduce dissensions amongst the patriots than to subdue the loyalists. But when did riot fail to go hand in hand with war?

Great Britain determined. Great Britain, on her part, was united. Few and faint were the voices raised in defence of the Americans, since the news of Lexington and Bunker Hill. Edmund Burke and one or two of the same spirit continued to plead for the American cause, but all unavailingly. The last petition of Congress to the king was rejected. A bill of confiscation, as it may be called, was passed against the trade, the merchandise, and the shipping of the colonies; whatever crews might be captured were to be impressed into the British navy. The army in America was augmented to forty thousand, partly by British and partly by German troops. In fine, the reduction of the colonies was the one great object with the larger part of the people, as with the rulers of Great Britain.

All the while, Washington was before Boston. But his attention was not wholly concentrated there. On the con-

Washington before Boston.

trary, his voice was to be heard in all directions, on the march to Canada, in the posts of New York, on board the national cruisers, at the meetings of committees and assemblies, in the provincial legislatures, within Congress itself, every where pointing out what was to be done, and the spirit in which it was to be done. They who doubt his military ability or his intellectual greatness will do well to follow him through these first months of the war; if they do it faithfully, they will doubt no more. The activity, the judgment, the executive power, and above all the moral power of the great general and the great man are nowhere in history more conspicuous than in those rude lines before Boston.

Recovery of the town.

To add to the difficulties of the siege, the army went through a complete process of disbanding and recruiting, on account of the general unwillingness to serve for any length of time. Without men and without munitions, Washington sublimely kept his post, until, after months of disappointment, he obtained the means to take possession of Dorchester Heights, whence the town was completely commanded. The enemy, under General Howe, had long meditated the evacuation of the place; and they now the more readily agreed to leave it on condition that they should be unmolested. The 17th of March, 1776, eight months and a half from the time that Washington undertook the siege, his generalship and his constancy were rewarded with success.

The victory.

It was certainly an amazing victory. "I have been here months together," he wrote to his brother, "with what will scarcely be believed, not thirty rounds of musket cartridges to a man. . . . We have maintained our ground against the enemy under this want of powder, and we have disbanded one army, and recruited another, within musket shot of two and twenty regiments, the flower

of the British army, whilst our force has been but little, if any, superior to theirs; and, at last, have beaten them into a shameful and precipitate retreat out of a place the strongest by nature on this continent, and strengthened and fortified at an enormous expense." Such being the result of the only operation in which the Americans and the British met each other as actual armies, there was reason for Washington and his true-hearted countrymen to exult and to hope.

Increasing perils. But the country was in danger. An attack was feared at New York; another at Charleston: the whole coast, indeed, lay open and defenceless. The year of warfare ended in greater apprehensions and in greater perils than those in which it began.

CHAPTER III.

Declaration of Independence.

Transformation of colonies to states.

The colonies were fighting at a disadvantage. Not only were their resources, in a military point of view, inferior to those of their great antagonist; this was but a minor consideration with them. They were taxed with rebellion; they were branded with the name of rebels by their enemies, nay, by those of their own people who opposed the war. On many, these epithets made no impression; they were rather acceptable than otherwise to the more ardent and the more violent. But to the moderate and to the calm, it was intolerable to be charged with mere sedition. They to whom the nation owed all that was prudent, as well as valiant in its present situation, were men of law and order in a peculiar degree. The earliest care with those of Massachusetts, after the affair of Lexington, had been to prove that the British troops were the first to fire; in other words, that the people were defending, and not transgressing, their rights. So now it became a matter of the highest interest to set the war in its true light, by raising the Americans from the position of subjects to that of a nation. There was but one way, and this the transformation of the colonies into states.

Idea of independence.

The idea of independence, however, was of slow growth. The Mecklenburg declaration, as we have read, found no favor. The general, if not the

universal, sentiment was still in favor of reconciliation. "During the course of my life," said John Jay in later years, "and until after the second petition of Congress in 1775, I never heard an American of any class or of any description express a wish for the independence of the colonies." But when that petition of Congress to the king was rejected, when the English government, in consequence, pledged itself to continue its system of oppression, then the resolution of the colonies rose, all the more determined for having been delayed.

North Carolina and Virginia.

Nearly a year had elapsed since the North Carolinians of Mecklenburg county made their declaration, when the North Carolinians of the entire colony united in authorizing their delegates in Congress to concur with those of the other colonies in declaring independence, (April 23, 1776.) A few weeks afterwards, (May 15,) the Virginians instructed their delegates to propose a declaration of independence to Congress.

Congress.

Congress had already committed itself. Its recommendations of the year previous to some of the colonies, that they should set up governments for themselves, had just been extended to all. It had also voted "that the exercise of every kind of authority under the crown should be totally suppressed," (May 15.) What else was this than to pronounce the colonies independent states? Subsequent resolutions and declarations were but the carrying out of the decision already made.

Hesitation.

But as it had not been made, so it was not carried out without hesitation. More than one earnest mind, bent upon independence in the end, considered the course of things thitherward to be much too hurried. "My countrymen," wrote Washington, (April 1,) "from their form of government, and their steady attachment heretofore to royalty, will come reluctantly into the idea of inde-

pendence; but time and persecution bring many wonderful things to pass." He was right; the spirits and numbers of those resolved upon immediate independence increased apace

Lee's resolution.

The instructions of Virginia were soon obeyed. Upon the journals of Congress, under date of June 7, there occurs an affecting entry of "certain resolutions respecting independency being moved and seconded." No names are mentioned, no words of the resolutions are recorded. It is as if Congress had felt its own feebleness in comparison with the solemnity of the cause, and so deeply, as to hold its breath and give no sign of what was passing. The mover was Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia, the seconder John Adams, of Massachusetts; and the resolution was, "That these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent states; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British crown; and that all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved."

Debate.

Opposition was immediate and resolute. At its head stood John Dickinson, of Pennsylvania, whose ten years' championship of colonial rights was assurance of his present faithfulness. The ground common to him and to the other opponents of the resolution was simply the prematureness of the measure. Nor does it seem that they were altogether mistaken. Whatever was urged by the advocates of the resolution, there were but seven colonies, the barest possible majority, to unite in favor of a proceeding so decisive, (June 10.) Instead of pressing their views, the party in favor of the resolution were wise enough to postpone its final disposition for several weeks. On the other side, the opposing party, so far from exciting the country against the resolution, appear to have decided that it should have a fair consideration, and that if the colonies

rejecting it could be brought to favor it, they would be satisfied by the delay that had been interposed for deliberation

Committee on declaration.

At the same time, a committee was appointed to prepare a declaration according to the tenor of the resolution. Thomas Jefferson, of Virginia, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, of Pennsylvania, Roger Sherman, of Connecticut, and Robert R. Livingston, of New York, constituting the committee, united upon a draught by Jefferson. "Whether I had gathered my ideas," he said at a later time, "from reading or reflection, I do not know. I know only that I turned to neither book nor pamphlet while writing it. I did not consider it as any part of my charge to invent new ideas altogether, and to offer no sentiment which had never been expressed before." Truth to be told, there was neither originality nor novelty in the production. Its facts, so far as they related to the course of Britain or of the British king, were peculiar to the cause at issue. But the principles of human and of colonial rights were substantially such as Englishman after Englishman, as well as American after American, had asserted. The merit of the document was its appropriateness, its harmony with the ideas of a people who had risen to defend their birthright, rather than to win any thing not already theirs. The committee reported the declaration to Congress, (June 28.)

Resolution adopted.

Its adoption depended upon the adoption of the resolution of which it was but the expression. The resolution was therefore called up, (July 1.) A day's debate ensued; nor was the decision unanimous. Four delegations hung back; one, New York, because it had received no instructions to vote upon so grave a question; the other three, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and South Carolina, on account of their own reluctance. The South

Carolinians asked the postponement of a definitive vote until the next morning. When the morning came, they withdrew their opposition. The Pennsylvanian and Delaware delegates — some members retiring and others coming in — gave their voices likewise to the resolution. It thus received the unanimous vote of all the colonies, New York excepted, and she only for a few days, until her delegates could be instructed to concur with their colleagues, (July 9–15.) It was the 2d of July, 1776, the true date of American independence.*

And the declaration.

The declaration followed as a matter of course. It was delayed only to receive a few amendments, when it was adopted by the same vote as the resolution, (July 4.)

The United States.

Thus were the colonies of Great Britain transformed into the United States of America. "As free and independent states," were the words of the declaration, "they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent states may of right do." No longer the subjects of Great Britain, but an equally independent nation, the United States were no longer open to imputations upon their course from abroad, or to doubts of it amongst themselves. When Admiral Lord Howe, and his brother, the general, commander-in-chief of the British army, offered amnesty in the king's name to all Americans who would return to their allegiance, the offer was regarded as a national insult by Congress. What had Great Britain to forgive, or who had asked for forgiveness?

The day after a committee had been appointed to draw

* As the utmost discrepancy exists amongst the later histories as to these votes and dates, it seems advisable to state that Jefferson and Adams are the authorities followed in the text.

Plan of confederation.

up the declaration, another, and a larger one, received the charge of preparing a plan of confederation, (June 12.) This was reported a week after the adoption of the declaration, but no action was taken upon it, (July 12.) Circumstances postponed any decision; nor were the Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union, as they were styled, actually adopted by Congress until more than a year later, (November 15–17, 1777,) when they were recommended to the states for adoption. A long time elapsed before all the states complied.

Unity in Congress.

Meanwhile Congress continued to be the uniting as well as the governing authority. Its members, renewed from time to time by their respective constituencies, met together as the representatives, not merely of the different states, but of the common nation. It was imperfectly, as we shall perceive, that Congress served the purpose of a central power. Its treaties, its laws, its finances, its armaments, all depended upon the consent and the coöperation of the states. But it continued to be the body in which the states were blended together, however variously, in one.

State constitutions.

The states were every where forming governments of their own. Massachusetts took the lead, as was observed, in the early summer of 1775. Six or seven months afterwards, New Hampshire organized her assembly and council, with a president of the latter body, (1776.) The same year brought about the establishment of state authorities in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North and South Carolina. Of the other states, Rhode Island and Connecticut were naturally content with the liberal governments which already existed under their ancient charters. New York and Georgia set up their governments a year subsequently, (1777.) But the original forms underwent numerous and

repeated modifications; each state amending its constitution or constructing a new one, according to its exigencies. As a general thing, each had a governor, with or without a council, for an executive; a council, or Senate, and a House of Representatives, for a legislature; and one or more judicial bodies for a judiciary. Indeed, the states were much more thoroughly organized than the nation.

Divisions amongst the people.

Both constitutions and declarations had arisen amidst the most distracting divisions. The differences in Congress, or amongst the leading class throughout the country, were trifling in comparison with the factions of the people as a whole. On this side were flaming patriots, who thought nothing done unless outcry and force were employed; on that were selfish and abject spirits, thinking that nothing should be done at all. Tories, or loyalists, abounded in one place; in another, rioters and marauders; every where dark plots were laid, dark deeds perpetrated. The greater was the work of those, the few, the wise, and the devoted, who led the nation through its strifes to independence.

CHAPTER IV.

War, continued.

Second Period.

Three periods.

The war of independence naturally divides itself into three periods. Of these, the first has been described in a preceding chapter, as beginning with the arming of Massachusetts, in October, 1774, and extending to the recovery of Boston, in March, 1776 — a period of a year and a half, of which something less than a year, dating from the affrays at Lexington and Concord, was actually a period of war. We are now to go through the second and third periods.

Characteristics of the second period.

The second period is of little more than two years — from April, 1776, to July, 1778. The chief points to characterize it are these, namely, that the main operations were in the north, and that the Americans fought their battles without allies.

Reception of the Declaration.

The Declaration of Independence was transmitted to the commander-in-chief, with the request of Congress to "have it proclaimed at the head of the army." It was what both commander and army had been waiting for. "The general hopes" — thus ran the order of the day — "that this important event will serve as a fresh incentive to every officer and soldier to act with fidelity and courage, as knowing that now the peace and safety of his country depend, under God, solely on the success of our

arms, and that he is now in the service of a state possessed of sufficient power to reward his merit and advance him to the highest honors of a free country," (July 9.) On the same day, Washington wrote to the president of Congress: "I caused the Declaration to be proclaimed before all the army under my immediate command, and have the pleasure to inform Congress that the measure seemed to have their most hearty assent; the expressions and behavior, both of officers and men, testifying their warmest approbation of it." The adhesion of the army was one thing; their obedience to the inspiration which their commander suggested was another. But, for the moment, a new impulse seemed to be felt by all.

Defence of Charleston.

A brilliant feat of arms had preceded the declaration. The anticipated descent upon the southern coast was made off Charleston, by a British force, partly land and partly naval, under the command of General Clinton and Admiral Parker. The Americans, chiefly militia, were under General Lee. Fort Sullivan,* a few miles below Charleston, became the object of attack. It was so gallantly defended, the fort itself by Colonel Moultrie, and an adjoining battery by Colonel Thomson, that the British were obliged to abandon their expedition and retire to the north, (June 28.) A long time passed before the enemy reappeared in the south.

Loss of New York.

Meanwhile Washington had transferred his quarters from Boston to New York, (April 13,) which he was busy in fortifying against the expected foe. Troops from Halifax, under General Howe, joined by British and Hessians under Admiral Howe, and by the discomfited forces of the southern expedition, landed at various times on Staten Island, to the number of between twenty

* Afterwards Fort Moultrie.

and thirty thousand. The number of the Americans was considerably less. After long delays, the enemy crossed to Long Island, and routed the American detachments under General Putnam, (August 27.) A speedy retreat to New York Island alone saved the Americans from a surrender. A fortnight after, the British crossed in pursuit, the advanced posts of the Americans actually flying before them, (September 15.) The city of New York was at once evacuated by Washington, who led his forces towards the north. "We are now encamped," he writes, "with the main body of the army on the Heights of Haerlem, where I should hope the enemy would meet with a defeat in case of an attack, if the generality of our troops would behave with tolerable bravery. But experience, to my extreme affliction, has convinced me that this is rather to be wished for than expected." He did not write thus without good reason. Little besides incompetency and desertion on the part of his men had attended his vain attempt to save New York.

Loss of Lake Champlain and the lower Hudson.

Loss succeeded loss. Two defeats on Lake Champlain drove the Americans, under Benedict Arnold, not only from the lake, but from the fortress of Crown Point, (October 11–14.) In the neighborhood of New York, Washington was obliged to abandon one position after another; the defeat of White Plains (October 28) making still farther retreat necessary. The forts upon the Hudson were presently lost; Fort Washington being taken with its garrison, (November 16,) and Fort Lee being evacuated, (November 20.) With a diminishing army, in which, moreover, he had lost his confidence, the commander-in-chief decided to fall back from the banks of the Hudson into New Jersey.

Loss of Newport.

At the same time that the Americans were retreating from New York, another of their chief

towns upon the seaboard was captured. A large detachment from the British army took possession of Newport without a blow, (December 8.) The island was overrun, and Providence blockaded.

Defence of New Jersey.

Losses increased defections. "Between you and me," writes Washington on his retreat, "I think our affairs are in a very bad condition, — not so much from the apprehension of General Howe's army, as from the defection of New York, the Jerseys, and Pennsylvania. In short, the conduct of the Jerseys has been most infamous. . . . If every nerve is not strained, . . . I think the game is pretty nearly up," (December 18.) Disheartening as were the circumstances, he called around him his more faithful officers, and with them planned an achievement which seemed to require all the encouragements of prosperity and of sympathy. Followed by his handful of twenty-four hundred, while other detachments failed to keep up with him, he crossed the Delaware amid the ice and the cold of Christmas night, and on the following morning took a thousand Hessian prisoners at Trenton. The British immediately advanced against him. He could not meet them; for it would be destruction to his inferior numbers. He would not retreat before them; for it would be despair to his gallant adherents. To avoid either alternative, he marched, after a slight engagement, round the flank and upon the rear of the hostile army. Three hundred prisoners, the safety and the increased animation of his soldiers and his countrymen, were his reward. The only drawback was the loss of many brave spirits, amongst whom none was braver than General Mercer. Had Washington had but a few hundred fresh troops, he would have pushed on to Brunswick and destroyed the entire stores of the enemy. As it was, the rising of the militia, and the continued activity of Washington, even in his winter quarters, cleared the

state of the invaders, excepting at Brunswick and Amboy. Six months after, it was totally evacuated, (June 30, 1777.)

Organisation of army.

All the time that Washington was thus retreating and advancing, he was enforcing the lesson of his experiences upon the government. He could do comparatively little, as he repeatedly informed Congress, for want of no less essential an instrument than an army. The American forces, during the campaign, had consisted in part of continental, or regular, and in part of militia troops, all raised on different terms, — that is, by different bounties and under different appointments, — by the different states. What Washington wanted, what the country needed, was an army recruited, officered, equipped, and paid upon a national system. Nor was Congress insensible to the necessity. Before the declaration of independence, a board of war and of ordnance had been chosen from the members of Congress, to direct the military affairs of the nation. Afterwards, when the calamities of the autumn were weighing heavily, Congress ordered the formation of a continental army. But the wants, thus attempted to be supplied, continued. It was left entirely to the states to raise the troops and to appoint all but the general officers, while the pay and the term of enlistment proposed by Congress were wholly inadequate to the emergencies on which Washington insisted. "The measure was not commenced," wrote he to his brother, "till it was too late to be effected, and then in such a manner as to bid adieu to every hope of getting an army from which any services are to be expected." "The unhappy policy of short enlistments," the need of "some greater encouragement" in pay, "the different states' nominating such officers as are not fit to be shoeblacks," the tendency of the states to fall back from regular troops upon the militia, "a destructive, expensive, and disorderly mob," — all these complaints from the commander-in-chief show that there was still no organization of the army.

Dictatorship. Alarmed by the disasters of the time, Congress resolved, "that General Washington shall be, and he is hereby, vested with full, ample, and complete powers" to raise, officer, and equip an army. To provide for its necessities, he was authorized "to take, wherever he may be, whatever he may want for the use of the army, if the inhabitants will not sell it, allowing a reasonable price for the same." He was also commissioned "to arrest and confine persons who refuse to take the continental currency, or are otherwise disaffected to the American cause," (December 27, 1776.) This commission of a dictatorship, the last resort of the ineffective Congress, and yet one of that body's wisest deeds, was to continue six months. It was afterwards renewed in much the same terms. But the powers were too dictatorial for such a man as Washington to exercise fully; nor did the partial use which he made of them effect the object of so great importance in his eyes. The war went on without any thing that could be called an actual army on the American side.

Paper money. The want of an army sprang, to a great degree, from the want of a treasury. Congress, voting all sorts of appropriations, had no way of meeting them but by continued issues of paper money. These soon began to depreciate; the depreciation required larger amounts to be put forth; and then the larger amounts added to the depreciation. When the value of the bills had sunk very low, an attempt was made to restore the currency by recalling the old issues and sending out new ones; but these, too, depreciated fast. Then lotteries were resorted to, and loans, both at home and abroad. The states were called in, and taxes raised by them were substituted for the national bills. But the embarrassments of the finances were irreparable. Every year added to the debt and to the poverty of the nation.

Arrival of Lafayette

In the midst of trials so various and so profound, there was a thrill of hope. It was caused by the arrival of a Frenchman, not yet twenty years old, who came bearing the sympathies of the old world to the new. "It was the last combat of liberty," wrote Lafayette, as he afterwards recalled his early inspirations. While he was hastening his departure from France, the news of the defeats in New York arrived, to throw the American cause into the shade, even in the eyes of the commissioners who had been sent to seek supplies in France. They would have dissuaded the young Frenchman from his projects. "We must be of good cheer," he replied; "it is in danger that I like best to share your fortunes." Escaping the pursuit of the government, who would have prevented a man of so high a rank as the Marquis de Lafayette from compromising them with the English by joining the Americans; tearing himself from a brilliant home, and a wife as young in years as he, Lafayette crossed the sea in his own vessel, and reached the coast of Carolina in safety. He hastened to Philadelphia to offer his services to Congress, which, more and more wont to be behindhand in its mission, gave him a cold welcome through the committee of foreign affairs. "The coldness was such," he wrote, "as to amount to a rejection; but without being disconcerted by the manner of the members, I begged them to return to the hall, and to read the following note: 'After the sacrifices which I have made, I have the right to demand two favors: one is to serve at my own expense, the other to commence as a volunteer.'" Congress was touched, and appointed the generous stranger a major-general, (July 31, 1777.) He found no hesitation in the welcome which he received from Washington on their first meeting. "Make my head quarters your home," was the warm and appreciative greeting from the commander-in-chief to the young major-general.

The army and the people imitated Washington's example, and gave their confidence to the noble Frenchman, with joy that their cause had attracted such a champion.

Defeat of Burgoyne.

The spring of 1777 was marked only by some predatory excursions from the British side into Connecticut, and from the American into Long Island. The summer brought about the evacuation of New Jersey, as has been mentioned. But the British retired only to strike harder elsewhere. A well-appointed army under General Burgoyne was already on its march from Canada to Lake Champlain and the Hudson. As this descended, it was the plan of the British in New York to ascend the Hudson, meeting the other army, and cutting off the communication between New England and her sister states. It was a promising scheme, and the first movements in it were successful. Burgoyne took Ticonderoga, and swept the adjacent country, menacing Northern New York on his right, and the Green Mountain region on his left. General St. Clair, who had evacuated Ticonderoga, could make no resistance; nor was his superior officer, General Schuyler, the commander of the northern army, in any position to check the advance of the enemy. But Schuyler bore up bravely; and the officers under him did their part. A British detachment against Bennington was defeated by John Stark and his New England militia, (August 16.) Fort Schuyler was defended by continental troops, the British retiring on the approach of reënforcements under Arnold, (August 22.) Just as these reverses had checked the advance of Burgoyne, the gallant Schuyler was ousted of his command to make room for General Gates, a very inferior man, if not a very inferior general. He, profiting by the preparations of his predecessor, met the British, and defeating them in two actions near Saratoga, (September 19, October 7,) compelled them to surrender. Nearly six

thousand troops laid down their arms; but more than twice that number were now collected on the American side, (October 16.)

Loss of the Hudson Highlands.

While this triumph was won, losses were still occurring elsewhere. The advance of the British from New York, after being strangely delayed, began with the capture of the forts which protected the Highlands, (October 5–6.) But on proceeding some way farther up the river, the enemy found it advisable to return to New York.

Loss of Philadelphia.

The main army of Great Britain was that which Washington had to deal with in New Jersey and the vicinity. "If General Howe can be kept at bay," wrote the commander-in-chief, "and prevented from effecting his principal purposes, the successes of General Burgoyne, whatever they may be, must be partial and temporary." After much uncertainty as to the intentions of the British general, he suddenly appeared in the Chesapeake, and landing, prepared to advance against Philadelphia, (August 25.) Washington immediately marched his entire army of about eleven thousand to stop the progress of the enemy. Notwithstanding the superior number — about seventeen thousand — opposed to him, Washington decided that battle must be given for the sake of Philadelphia. After various skirmishes, a general engagement took place by the Brandywine, resulting in the defeat of the Americans, (September 11.) But so little were they dispirited, that their commander decided upon immediately fighting a second battle, which was prevented only by a great storm. Washington then withdrew towards the interior, and Howe took possession of Philadelphia, (September 26.) Not yet willing to abandon the city, Washington attacked the main division of the British encamped at Germantown. At the very moment of victory, a panic

seized the Americans, and they retreated, (October 4.) There was no help for Philadelphia; it was decidedly lost.

Washington's embarrassments.

The contrast between the defeat of Burgoyne and the loss of Philadelphia was made a matter of reproach to the commander-in-chief. Let him make his own defence. "I was left," he says, "to fight two battles, in order, if possible, to save Philadelphia, with less numbers than composed the army of my antagonist. . . . Had the same spirit pervaded the people of this and the neighboring states, . . . as the states of New York and New England, . . . we might before this time have had General Howe nearly in the situation of General Burgoyne, with this difference — that the former would never have been out of reach of his ships, whilst the latter increased his danger every step he took." More than this, Washington conducted his operations in a district where great disaffection to the American cause cut off supplies for the army, and intelligence of the enemy. To have done what he did, notwithstanding these embarrassments, was greater than a victory. It was felt to be so at the time. "Nothing," said the French minister, the Count de Vergennes, to the American commissioners in France, — "nothing has struck me so much as General Washington's attacking and giving battle to General Howe's army: to bring an army, raised within a year, to this, promises every thing."

Loss of the Delaware.

The enemy were not yet secure in Philadelphia, the Delaware below the city being still in the possession of the Americans. Nor did they give it up without a struggle. Fort Mercer, upon the Jersey shore, was gallantly defended under Lieutenant Colonel Christopher Greene against a Hessian attack, (October 22;) but when Fort Mifflin, upon an island in the river, gave way after a noble struggle, under Lieutenant Colonel Sam-

uel Smith, (November 15,) Fort Mercer was evacuated, and the Delaware was lost, (November 20.) An attack meditated by the Americans upon Philadelphia, and one attempted by the British upon the American camp at Whitemarsh, (December 5–8,) resulted in nothing. The operations of 1777 were ended.

Wickes's cruise. One enterprise of the year is not to be passed over. Captain Wickes, of the cruiser Reprisal, after distinguishing himself in the West Indies, sailed for France in the autumn of 1776. Encouraged by his success in making prizes in the Bay of Biscay, Wickes started on a cruise round Ireland in the following summer, (1777.) Attended by the Lexington and the Dolphin, the Reprisal swept the Irish and the English seas of their merchantmen. But on the way to America, the Lexington was captured, and the Reprisal, with the gallant Wickes and all his crew, was lost on the coast of Newfoundland. It was for the navy, of which Wickes was so great an ornament, that a national flag had been adopted in the summer of his cruise, (June 14.)

Cabal against Washington. "I see plainly," wrote Lafayette to Washington, at the close of the year, "that America can defend herself, if proper measures are taken; but I begin to fear that she may be lost by herself and her own sons. When I was in Europe, I thought that here almost every man was a lover of liberty, and would rather die free than live a slave. You can conceive my astonishment, when I saw that toryism was as apparently professed as whiggism itself." "We must not," replied Washington, "in so great a contest, expect to meet with nothing but sunshine." These mournful complaints, this cheerful answer, referred to an intrigue that had been formed against Washington, for the purpose of displacing him from his command. Generals Gates and Mifflin, both members of the

board of war, lately organized, with Conway, a foreign general in the service, were at the head of a cabal, which was secretly supported by some members of Congress. Had their unworthy plots prevailed, had their anonymous letters to the civil authorities, and their underhand appeals to military men, succeeded, Washington would have been superseded by Gates or by Lee, it was uncertain which, both of British birth, both of far more selfishness than magnanimity, of far more pretension than power. Gates, as we shall read hereafter, met the most utter of all the defeats, Lee conducted the most shameful of all the retreats, in which the Americans were involved. Happily for the struggling nation, these men were not its leaders. The cabal in which they were involved fell asunder; yet without crushing them beneath its ruins. They retained their offices and their honors, as well as Washington.

Army quarrels.

The army was full of quarrels. Sectional jealousies were active, the northern man distrusting the southern, and the southern the northern. National jealousies were equally rife, the American officers opposing the foreign, and the foreign officers the American. More serious, because more reasonable, were the angry feelings excited in the army against Congress, now for its interference, and now for its neglect. Much ill will on both sides was excited by the question of half pay for life to the officers; it being opposed in Congress, and settled only by a compromise of half pay for seven years after the conclusion of the war. Washington contended with all the intellectual and moral strength of his nature against the jealousy which Congress unhappily entertained of the army. "The prejudices of other countries," as he says, "have only gone to them [the troops] in time of peace. . . . It is our policy to be prejudiced against them in time of war; though they are citizens, having all the ties and interests of citizens."

Army sufferings.

The experience of the past twelvemonth had given Washington more confidence in his soldiers. He had had time to learn their better points, their enthusiasm, their endurance, their devotion. The winter following the loss of Philadelphia was one of cruel sufferings, and the manner in which they were borne formed a new link between the troops and the commander. His remonstrances against the jealousies of Congress are accompanied by representations of the agonies of the army. "Without arrogance or the smallest deviation from truth, it may be said that no history now extant can furnish an instance of an army's suffering such hardships as ours has done, bearing them with the same patience and fortitude. To see men without clothes to cover their nakedness, without blankets to lie on, without shoes, (for the want of which their marches might be traced by the blood from their feet,) and almost as often without provisions as with them; marching through frost and snow, and at Christmas taking up their winter quarters within a day's march of the enemy, without a house or hut to cover them, till they could be built, and submitting without a murmur, is a proof of patience and obedience which, in my opinion, can scarce be paralleled." This story, at once so heroic and so sad, is dated from Valley Forge.

Aspect of Congress.

Congress, meanwhile, though finding time to abet the enemies of Washington, and to suspect his faithful followers, was far from active in promoting the interests of the nation. Great changes had taken place in the composition of the assembly. Many of the earlier members had retired, some to the offices of their respective states, some to the field, some to diplomacy, some to private life. But a very small number attended the sessions; twenty-five or thirty making what was now considered quite a full Congress. "America once had a representation," wrote Alexander Hamilton, one of Washington's

aids, from head quarters, "that would do honor to any age or nation. The present falling off is very alarming and dangerous."

Treaty with France.

The question of foreign alliances had been started at an early date. It met with very considerable opposition. The more earnest spirits thought it humiliating to court the protection of the European powers. They also thought it more likely to increase the dangers than the resources of the country to be drawn into the interests and the intrigues of the old world. But as time passed, and the difficulties of the war increased, the tendency to foreign connections grew stronger. Before the declaration of independence, Silas Deane was sent to France, as an agent, with hints of an alliance. Ere he reached his destination, a secret subsidy had been promised to the Americans. Meanwhile a committee of Congress was appointed "to prepare a plan of treaties to be proposed to foreign powers," (June, 1776.) Their plan being adopted, Deane, Benjamin Franklin, and Arthur Lee, of Virginia, were appointed commissioners to France, (September;) others being sent to Spain, Prussia, Austria, and Tuscany, (December.) The French envoys, amongst whom Deane gave place to John Adams, devoted quite as much attention to their own disputes as to the negotiations with which they were intrusted. But the disposition of France against her old enemy of England was too decided to require much diplomacy on the part of America. After a year's delay, a treaty between the French king, Louis XVI., and the United States was made, (January 30, February 6, 1778,) and ratified, (May 5.)

British conciliation.

The news of the treaty broke like a thunderbolt upon the British ministry. Three years had their armies, superior both in discipline and in number, contended against the so-called rebels; and what had been gained? A few towns on the seaboard, New York, New-

port, Philadelphia, the islands near New York, the island on which Newport stands, the lower banks of the Hudson and of the Delaware. This was all. Nothing had been, nothing, it must have almost seemed, could be, gained except upon the coast; the interior was untenable, if not unconquerable. And what had been lost? Twenty thousand troops, hundreds of vessels, millions of treasure; to say nothing of the colonial commerce, once so precious, and now so worthless. It might well strike the ministry, that they must win back their colonies by some other means than war, especially if the French were to be parties in the strife. Accordingly, Lord North laid before Parliament a bill renouncing the purpose of taxing America, and another providing for commissioners to bring about a reconciliation, (February 17.) The bills were passed, and three commissioners were appointed to act with the military and the naval commanders in procuring the submission of the United States. To their proposals Congress returned an answer on the anniversary of Bunker Hill, refusing to enter into any negotiations until the independence of the nation was recognized. The commissioners appealed from Congress to the states; but in vain. Their mission was fruitless, except in proving that the United States would never relapse into British colonies.

Recovery of Philadelphia.

Desirous of concentrating his forces before the French appeared in the field, Sir Henry Clinton, now the British commander-in-chief, evacuated Philadelphia, (June 18.) Washington instantly set out in pursuit of the enemy. Coming up with them in a few days, he ordered General Lee, commanding the van of the army, to begin the attack in the morning. Lee began it by making a retreat, notwithstanding the remonstrances of Lafayette, who had held the command until within a few hours. But for Washington's coming up in time to arrest

the flight of the troops under Lee, and to protect the advance of his own soldiers, the army would have been lost. As it was, he formed his line and drove the British from the field of Monmouth, (June 28.) They stole away in the night, and reached New York with still more loss from desertion than from battle.

Possession of Illinois.

At about the same time, a Virginia expedition, under the command of Major Clarke, surprised the British garrison at Kaskaskia, (July 4,) and took possession of the surrounding villages. The more important post of Vincennes was afterwards secured by the aid of its French inhabitants.* The country was organized as a part of Virginia, under the name of Illinois county.

End of the period.

Thus the end of the period finds the Americans conquerors as well as the British. If the latter have New York and Newport, with their neighborhoods, the former are in possession of Illinois. The main forces on either side are again where they were at the beginning of the period, save that the British are now in New York, and the Americans waiting their opportunity to retake the city. "It is not a little pleasing, nor less wonderful to contemplate," wrote Washington from his camp at White Plains, "that after two years' manœuvring, and undergoing the strangest vicissitudes that perhaps ever attended any one contest since the creation, both armies are brought back to the very point they set out from, and that the offending party at the beginning is now reduced to the use of the spade and pickaxe for defence. The hand of Providence has been so conspicuous in all this, that he need be worse than an infidel that lacks faith, and more than wicked that has not gratitude enough to acknowledge his obligations."

* It was subsequently surprised by a British party, but recovered by Clarke in the beginning of the following year.

CHAPTER V.

War, continued.

Third Period.

Charac-teristics. The third and last period of the war extends from July, 1778, to January, 1784, five years and a half. Its characteristics are, the alliance of the French with the Americans, and the concentration of the more important operations in the Southern States. These points, it is to be noted, are precisely the opposite of those which characterized the preceding period.

Failure to recover Newport. The first minister of France to the United States, M. Gérard, came accompanied by a fleet and army, under D'Estaing, (July.) "Unforeseen and unfavorable circumstances," as Washington wrote, "lessened the importance of the French services in a great degree." In the first place, the arrival was just late enough to miss the opportunity of surprising the British fleet in the Delaware, not to mention the British army on its retreat to New York. In the next place, the French vessels proved to be of too great draught to penetrate the channel and coöperate in an attack upon New York. Thus disappointing and disappointed, D'Estaing engaged in an enterprise against Newport, still in British hands. It proved another failure. But not through the French alone; the American troops that were to enter the island at the north being greatly behindhand. The same day that they took their place, under

Sullivan, Greene, and Lafayette, the French left theirs at the lower end of the island in order to meet the British fleet arriving from New York, (August 10.) A severe storm prevented more than a partial engagement; but D'Estaing returned to Newport only to plead the injuries received in the gale as compelling his retirement to Boston for repairs. The orders of the French government had been peremptory that in case of any damage to the fleet it should put into port at once. So far was D'Estaing from avoiding action on personal grounds, that when Lafayette hurried to Boston to persuade his countrymen to return, the commander offered to serve as a volunteer until the fleet should be refitted. The Americans, however, talked of desertion and of inefficiency, — so freely, indeed, as to affront their faithful Lafayette. At the same time, large numbers of them imitated the very course which they censured, by deserting their own army. The remaining forces retreated from their lines to the northern end of the island, and, after an engagement, withdrew to the mainland, (August 30.) It required all the good offices of Lafayette, of Washington, and of Congress, to keep the peace between the Americans and their allies. D'Estaing, soothed by the language of those whom he most respected, was provoked, on the other hand, by the hostility of the masses, both in the army and amongst the people. Collisions between his men and the Bostonians kept up his disgust; and, when his fleet was repaired, he sailed for the West Indies, (November.)

British and Indian ravages.

The summer and autumn passed away without any further exertions of moment upon the American side. On the part of the British, there was nothing attempted that would not have been far better unattempted. Marauding parties from Newport went against New Bedford and Fairhaven. Others from New York went against Little Egg Harbor. Tories and Indians —

"a collection of banditti," as they were rightly styled by Washington, descended from the northern country to wreak massacre at Wyoming and at Cherry Valley. The war seemed to be assuming a new character: it was one of ravages unworthy of any cause, and most unworthy of such a cause as the British professed to be.

Decline of American affairs.

Affairs were at a low state amongst the Americans. "The common interests of America," wrote Washington at the close of 1778, "are mouldering and sinking into irretrievable ruin." Was he who had never despaired at length despairing? There was reason to do so. "If I were to be called upon," he said, "to draw a picture of the times and of men, from what I have seen, heard, and in part know, I should in one word say that idleness, dissipation, and extravagance seem to have laid fast hold upon most of them; that speculation, peculation, and an insatiable thirst for riches seem to have got the better of every other consideration, and almost of every order of men; that party disputes and personal quarrels are the great business of the day; whilst the momentous concerns of an empire, a great and accumulating debt, ruined finances, depreciated money, and want of credit, which, in its consequences, is the want of every thing, are but secondary considerations, and postponed from day to day, from week to week, as if our affairs wore the most promising aspect. After drawing this picture, which from my soul I believe to be a true one, I need not repeat to you that I am alarmed, and wish to see my countrymen roused." This gloomy sketch is of the government — Congress and the various officials at Philadelphia. What was true of the government was true of the people, save only the diminishing rather than increasing class to which we have frequently referred, as constituting the strength of the nation.

A border warfare had been carried on during two suc-

Loss of Georgia.

cessive summers, (1777–78,) between East Florida and Georgia. The British authorities sent parties from their garrisons, on one side, and on the other, the Americans, chiefly Georgians and Carolinians, mustered their militia. Nothing, however, but alarm and bloodshed had been accomplished, when, at the close of 1778, a serious invasion of Georgia was planned by the British commander. Twenty-five hundred troops from New York, under the command of Lieutenant Colonel Campbell, landed near Savannah. Hardly nine hundred Americans, under General Howe, were there to oppose them; and, after a short encounter, the town was taken, (December 29.) A few days later, the only other strong place upon the seaboard, Sunbury, surrendered to a force of two thousand British, advancing, under General Prevost, from Florida. Prevost, taking command of the united forces of the British, sent Colonel Campbell against Augusta. The expedition, successful at first, was soon so threatened by the operations of various partisans, and by those of General Lincoln, the commander of the continental troops, that Campbell evacuated Augusta after a fortnight's possession. Prevost then advanced from Savannah. An American force, under General Ashe, was routed at Brier Creek, and Georgia was lost, (March 4, 1779.) A few months later, Sir James Wright, the royal governor at the beginning of the war, returned and set up the provincial government once more.

Defence of Charleston.

The conqueror of Georgia aspired to become the conqueror of Carolina. With chosen troops, and a numerous body of Indians, Prevost set out against Charleston. He was met before that town by the legion under Count Pulaski, a Pole who had been in the American service for nearly two years; but Pulaski's men were scattered, and Prevost pressed on. The militia, assembled for the defence of the place, were under the orders of Governor

Rutledge; the continental troops under those of Charleston's earlier defender, Moultrie. But the disparity of forces was fearful, and proposals for surrender were under consideration, when the approach of General Lincoln with his army compelled the British to retire, (May 12.) It was more than a month, however, before they left the adjacent country. They then withdrew to Savannah and St. Augustine.

Failure to recover Savannah.

The Americans were by no means disposed to acquiesce in the loss of Georgia. On the reappearance of the French fleet, under D'Estaing, after a successful cruise in the West Indies, he consented to join General Lincoln in an attack on Savannah, (September.) But he was too apprehensive of being surprised by the British fleet, as well as too desirous of getting back to the larger operations in the West Indies, to be a useful ally. The impatience of D'Estaing precipitated an assault upon the town, in which Pulaski fell, and both the French and the Americans suffered great loss, (October 9.) The French sailed southward; the Americans retired to the interior, leaving Savannah to the enemy.

Invasion of Virginia.

Previously to the events last described, Virginia had been invaded. An expedition from New York, landing at Portsmouth, plundered that town and all the neighboring country. Not a blow was struck against the foe. But booty rather than conquest being their object, they withdrew, (May.)

Operations in the north.

The operations in the north during the year were of altogether inferior importance. As the main body of the British continued at New York, Washington kept his small army in that vicinity. But he had no plans of decisive action. On making his preparations at the beginning of the year, he resolved upon an offensive course towards the Indians of Western New York, whose repeated hostilities, in conjunction with the British, were

chastised by an American expedition under General Sullivan, (August and September.) In relation to the British, Washington could hold only a defensive attitude. Yet, when Stony Point and Verplanck Point were taken, to the great peril of the Highland fortifications, as well as to the great interruption of intercourse with New England, Washington decided upon striking a blow. A gallant party, under the gallant Wayne, surprised the strong works which the British had constructed at Stony Point, (July 15,) and, though obliged to evacuate them, destroyed them, and recovered the Hudson, that is, the part which had been recently taken from the Americans. The fortification of West Point was undertaken, as an additional safeguard. In other directions, beyond the immediate reach of Washington, although never beyond his interest and his influence, the movements of the year were still less effective. Connecticut was invaded by a British force from New York, and great was the devastation, yet not without resistance, (July.) At the same period, a force from Massachusetts assailed a post which the British had taken on the Penobscot, but with great loss. Some months later, apprehensions of the French fleet induced the British commander to draw in his outposts on the Hudson and to evacuate Newport, (October.) These movements, effected without loss, or even collision, were the only ones of any strong bearing upon the issue of the war.

Jones's cruises.

Far away, upon the coasts of Great Britain itself, the war was now extended. Following in the track of the brave Wickes, John Paul Jones sailed in the Ranger from France to the coast of England and Scotland, entering Whitehaven, where he took the fortifications and fired the shipping of the fort. This was in the spring of 1778. In the spring of the following year, Jones being then in France, it was proposed that he should take the naval com-

mand of an expedition in which Lafayette was to be the general-in-chief, the object being nothing less than the invasion of England. This project failing, Jones got to sea in summer, with a squadron of seven sail, from a French port. Although much embarrassed by the insubordinate conduct of one of his chief officers, Jones pursued his cruise with great success along the Scotch coast. Thence descending on the eastern side of England, he encountered a fleet of merchantmen, under convoy of two vessels of war. The two were at once engaged — the larger, the Serapis, by Jones's Bonhomme Richard, and the smaller, the Countess of Scarborough, by the Pallas, under Captain Cottineau. It was a fearful and a remarkable action. Jones was exposed not only to the fire of his antagonist, but to that of one of his own vessels, from the treachery or the incompetency of its commander; and so completely battered was his ship, the Bonhomme Richard, that it went down sixteen hours after the surrender of the Serapis. The other British vessel also surrendered, (September 23, 1779.) The brave victor made his way safely to Holland.*

Spain in the war.

The war was gathering fresh combatants. Spain, after vainly offering her mediation between Great Britain and France, entered into the lists on the side of the latter power, (June, 1779.) There was no thought of the United States in the transaction. John Jay, hastily appointed minister to Spain, (September,) could not obtain a recognition of American independence. But the United States hailed the entrance of a new nation into the arena. It was so much against their enemy, however little it was for themselves.

The beginning of 1780 beheld large detachments from the British at New York, under Clinton, the commander-in-

* He did not return to America till the beginning of 1781.

Loss of South Carolina.

chief himself, on their way southward. Charleston, twice already assailed in vain, was the first object. The siege began with five thousand British against fifteen hundred Americans, (April 11;) the numbers afterwards increasing to eight thousand on the British side and three thousand on the American. The naval forces of the attack and the defence were still more unequal. Lincoln, yet in command of the southern army, made a brave resistance, but was of course overpowered. The loss of Charleston (May 12) was followed by the loss of the state, or the greater part of it. Three expeditions, the chief under Lord Cornwallis, penetrated into the interior without meeting any repulse. So complete was the prostration of South Carolina, that Clinton returned to New York, leaving Cornwallis to retain and to extend the conquest which had been made, (June.)

Failure to recover it.

All was not yet lost. The partisans of South Carolina, like those of Georgia, held out in the upper country, whence they made frequent descents upon the British posts. The names of Thomas Sumter and Francis Marion recall many a chivalrous enterprise. Continental troops and militia were marching from the north under De Kalb, the companion of Lafayette in his voyage, and under Gates, who assumed the command in North Carolina, (July.) Thence entering South Carolina in the hope of recovering it from its conquerors, Gates encountered Cornwallis near Camden, and, although much superior in numbers, was routed, — the militia of North Carolina and Virginia leaving the few continental troops to bear the brunt of the battle in vain. The brave De Kalb fell a sacrifice upon the field, (August 16.) Two days afterwards, Sumter was surprised by the British cavalry under Lieutenant Colonel Tarleton, and his party scattered. Marion was at the same time driven into North Carolina.

Abandonment of the south.

It seemed as if the south were given up to the foe. So little exertion to defend it was made in the other portions of the country, that a rumor gained ground of an intention to abandon South Carolina and Georgia altogether. The French minister, De La Luzerne, wrote home of still greater sacrifices in contemplation. He mentions the possibility of a proposal from the British that the other states should be acknowledged to be independent if the Carolinas, both North and South, and Georgia, were surrendered. Such a proposition was never made; but it must have been thought of and talked about. Such, too, were the sectional divisions in and out of Congress, that there were some to whom the abandonment of the south wore no look of horror or of wrong.

Its defence.

Fortunately there were others, and a far greater number, who never hesitated at the necessity of defending their southern brothers. Washington, still on the watch about New York, turned anxious glances to the operations at the south. "The affairs of the Southern States," he wrote to the president of Congress, "seem to be so exceedingly disordered, and their resources so much exhausted, that whatever may be undertaken there must chiefly depend on the means carried from hence. If these fail, we shall be condemned to a disgraceful and fatal inactivity." When Gates proved incompetent to the work, Washington appointed his best officer, Major General Greene, to save the invaded states and to keep the country whole, (October.)

Darkness in the north.

It was a dark time, even in the north. Washington had looked forward, at the opening of the year, to an active campaign; but the hopes of his heart died out one by one. Lafayette, returning from a year's absence in France, where he had been unwearied in upholding the interests of America, announced the coming of an armament, both land and naval, from his country. This

arrived at Newport, (July,) and there it remained during the rest of the year, blockaded by a British fleet. Washington's plans of an attack with the French upon New York fell through, to his great disappointment. What the French thought of the state of things may be gathered from a despatch of their commander, the Count de Rochambeau, to the government. "Upon our arrival here," he writes, "the country was in consternation. The paper money had fallen to sixty for one. . . . I landed with my staff without troops; nobody appeared in the streets; those at the windows looked sad and depressed. . . . Send us troops, ships, and money, but do not depend upon this people or upon their means." * It was soon afterwards that Washington wrote, "If either the temper or the resources of the country will not admit of an alteration, we may expect soon to be reduced to the humiliating condition of seeing the cause of America in America upheld by foreign arms." "But I give it as my opinion," he wrote again, "that a foreign loan is indispensably necessary to the continuance of the war." The autumn came, and Benedict Arnold, one of the officers upon whom the military fortunes of the nation had most depended, all but succeeded in betraying West Point to the enemy, (September.) He escaped, leaving Major André, with whom he had been treating, to die the death of a spy. A descent, partly of British, partly of loyalist Americans, and partly of Indians, surprised the fortresses and devastated the fields of Northern New York, (October.) Disaster was succeeding disaster, when Congress, listening to the exhortations of the commander-in-chief, again addressed itself to the organization of an army. It proposed enlistments of soldiers to continue

* Mr. Sparks's translation, in Washington's Writings, vol. vii. pp. 504–506.

during the war, and half pay of officers to continue afterwards and for life; but it was only a proposal. More effective were the exertions of the women of Pennsylvania, under the guidance of Mrs. Reed, the wife of the Pennsylvanian president, and those of New Jersey, led by Mrs. Dickinson, who raised generous subscriptions * to meet the necessities of the American army. "The spirit that animated the members of your association," wrote Washington to the ladies of Philadelphia on the death of Mrs. Reed, "entitles them to an equal place with any who have preceded them in the walk of female patriotism. It embellishes the American character with a new trait."

Light in the south.

Cornwallis, conqueror of South Carolina, prepared to march upon North Carolina. To secure the upper country, he detached a trusted officer, Major Ferguson, with a small band of regular troops and loyalists, in addition to whom large accessions were soon obtained from the tory part of the population. These recruits, like all of the same stamp, were full of hatred towards their countrymen on the American side; and fierce were the ravages of the party as Ferguson marched on. Aroused by the agony of the country, a considerable number of volunteers gathered, under various officers — Colonel Campbell, of Virginia, Colonels Cleaveland, Sevier, and Shelby, of North Carolina, and others. Nine hundred chosen men hastened to overtake the enemy, whom they found encamped in security on King's Mountain, near the frontier of South Carolina. The Americans never fought more resolutely. Ferguson was killed, and his surviving men surrendered at discretion, (October 7.) The march of Cornwallis was instantly checked; instead of advancing, he fell back. Nay,

* In paper money, upwards of $300,000; but in specie from $5000 to $7000.

more; a force which had been sent from New York to establish itself in Virginia was summoned by Cornwallis to his aid.

Holland in the war.

The year had been marked by important movements in Europe. The Empress Catharine of Russia put forth a declaration of independence, as it may be styled, in behalf of the neutral states, by proclaiming their right to carry on their commerce in time of war exactly as in time of peace, provided they conveyed no contraband articles. This doctrine was wholly at variance with the rights of search and of blockade, as asserted by England in relation to neutral nations. But it prevailed; and a league, by the name of the Armed Neutrality, soon comprehended nearly the whole of Europe. Little, however, was effected by it; the Empress of Russia herself called it her Armed Nullity. Yet the circle of hostility against England went on widening. On the accession of Holland to the Armed Neutrality, Great Britain, having just before captured a minister to the Dutch from the United States, — Henry Laurens, of South Carolina, — declared war at the close of 1780. But Holland no more became an ally of the United States than Spain had done.

Final adoption of the Confederation.

The "Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union between the States," adopted by Congress towards the end of 1777, were still in abeyance. The states to whom they were sent for approval had found many objections to the plan of union. Some of the larger states disliked the right of the smaller states to an equal vote with themselves in Congress. The smaller opposed the claims of the larger to the unoccupied lands of the country, alleging that what was won by common exertion should be turned to common advantage. One state — New Jersey — had the wisdom to object that Congress, or the general government, was not endowed with sufficient power, especially on the matter of regulating the trade of the coun-

try. These and other difficulties were but slowly surmounted. When all the rest had been removed, the question of the unoccupied lands was still a point upon which the articles hung motionless. The magnanimity with which this last obstacle was removed is a bright episode in the history of the times. New Jersey was the first of the smaller states to come into the Confederacy, relying upon the justice of her more powerful sisters, (November 20, 1778.) First of the landed states to cede her claims for the general welfare was New York, (February 19, 1780.) Her generosity, and the confidence of such states as New Jersey, induced the hitherto reluctant Maryland to waive her objections and sign the Articles. The thirteen were then complete, (March 1, 1781.)

Its inefficiency.

Congratulations were general, and well founded, so far as they related to the closer union of the states. But nothing had been gained on the score of a national government. On the contrary, something had been lost; the powers of Congress being rather diminished than increased under the Articles of Confederation. Before their adoption, a majority of states decided a question; now, nine out of the thirteen must be united to carry any measure. The half pay for life, for instance, that had been voted to the officers of the army, was reconsidered and refused by the Congress of the Confederation, for want of nine states to vote for its fulfilment. All this had been foreboded and lamented. "A nominal head, which at present is but another name for Congress, will no longer do," — thus wrote Washington. His aide-de-camp, Hamilton, wrote that Congress must be clothed with proper authority, "by resuming and exercising the discretionary powers originally vested in them," or "by calling immediately a convention of all the states, with full authority to conclude finally upon a general confederation," (1780.) Just before the adoption

of the Articles, the legislature of New York presented a formal memorial to Congress, saying, "We shall not presume to give our opinion on the question whether Congress has adequate powers or not. But we will without hesitation declare that, if they have not, they ought to have them, and that we stand ready on our part to confer them." If all these things could be said before the ratification of the Confederation, they could of course be repeated with even greater truth afterwards. A specimen of the inefficiency of the government occurs in relation to a proposal of import duties to be laid by Congress. Rhode Island refused to grant the necessary power to the government, and Virginia, after granting it, retracted it, (December, 1782.)

Defence of the Carolinas.

In the mean time events were hastening to a crisis in the field. General Greene, taking command of the southern army, with several American officers and the Pole Kosciuszko in his train, determined to save the Carolinas. He was confirmed in his purpose by his brigadier, General Morgan, who, distinguished in various actions, won a decisive victory over Tarleton at the Cowpens, in South Carolina, (January 17.) Two months later, Greene and Morgan having retreated in the interval, the main bodies of the armies, British and American, met at Guilford, in North Carolina, (March 15.) Both retired from the field; the Americans first, but the British with the greater loss. Cornwallis withdrew towards Wilmington, pursued by Greene, who presently dashed into South Carolina. There he was opposed by Lord Rawdon, who at once defeated him in an engagement at Hobkirk's Hill, near Camden, (April 25.) This was a cruel blow to Greene's hopes of surprising South Carolina. "This distressed country," he wrote, "cannot struggle much longer without more effectual support." But it was not in Greene's nature to despair. While he advanced against the stronghold of

Ninety-Six, in South Carolina, he detached a body of troops under Lieutenant Colonel Lee to join a band of Carolinians and Georgians who were besieging Augusta. The result was the surrender of that town, (June 5.) But the fort at Ninety-Six held out against repeated assaults, and Greene was obliged to retire before the superior force which Rawdon was leading to raise the siege, (June 19.) For a time, the war subsided; then Greene reappeared, and fought the action of Eutaw Springs. He lost the field of battle, (September 8;) but the British, under Colonel Stuart, were so much weakened as to give way, and retreat precipitately towards Charleston. Thus from defeat to defeat, without the intermission of a single victory, in the common sense, Greene had now marched, now retreated, in such a brave and brilliant way, as to force the enemy back upon the seaboard. The successes of the militia and of the partisan corps had been equally effective. All the upper country, not only of the Carolinas, but of Georgia, was once more in the American possession.

The central states in danger.

At the time when things were darkest at the south, greater perils arose at the centre of the country. Virginia was invaded in the first days of 1781 by a formidable force, chiefly of loyalists under the traitor Arnold. He took Richmond, but only to leave it and retire to Portsmouth, where he bade defiance both to the American militia and the French vessels from Newport, (January.) Soon after, two thousand British troops were sent from New York, under General Phillips, with directions to march up the Chesapeake against Maryland and Pennsylvania, (March.) This plan embraced the twofold idea of cutting off the Carolinas from all assistance, and of laying the central states equally prostrate. At about the same time, Cornwallis, baffled by Greene in North Carolina, set out to join the forces assembled in Virginia.

They, meanwhile, had penetrated the interior, swept the plantations and the towns, and taken Petersburg, (April.) The arrival of Cornwallis completed the array of the enemy, (May.) The very heart of the country was in danger.

Crisis.

"Our affairs," wrote Washington before the concentration of the enemy in Virginia, "are brought to an awful crisis." "Why need I run into details," he wrote again, "when it may be declared in a word, that we are at the end of our tether, and that now or never our deliverance must come?" "But we must not despair," he urged, as dangers accumulated; "the game is yet in our own hands; to play it well is all we have to do, and I trust the experience of error will enable us to act better in future. A cloud may yet pass over us, individuals may be ruined, and the country at large, or particular states, undergo temporary distress; but certain I am that it is in our power to bring the war to a happy conclusion."

American preparations.

The nation was far from being up to the emergency. A spirit of weariness and selfishness was prevailing among the people. The army, ill disciplined and ill paid, was exceedingly restless. Troops of the Pennsylvania and New Jersey lines had broken out into actual revolt at the beginning of the year. The government was still ineffective, the Confederation feeble, Congress inert, not to say broken down. When one reads that this body stood ready to give up the Mississippi to Spain, nay, to waive the express acknowledgment of American independence as an indispensable preliminary to negotiations with Great Britain, — when one reads these things, he may well wonder that there were any preparations to meet the exigencies of the times. The German Baron de Steuben, collecting troops in Virginia at the time of the invasion, was afterwards joined by Lafayette, whose troops had

been clad on their march at his expense. By sea, the French fleet was engaged in defending the coasts against the invader. It seemed as if the stranger were the only defender of Virginia and of America. But on the southern border was Greene, with his troops and his partisan allies. At the north was Washington, planning, acting, summoning troops from the states, and the French from Newport, to aid him in an attack upon New York, as the stronghold of the foe, until, convinced of the impossibility of securing the force required for such an enterprise, he resolved upon taking the command in Virginia, (August 14.) Thither he at once directed the greater part of his scanty troops, as well as of the French. The allied army was to be strengthened by the French fleet, and not merely by that of Newport, but by another and a larger fleet from the West Indies.

Defeat of Cornwallis.

The British under Cornwallis were now within fortified lines at Yorktown and Gloucester, (August 1–22.) There they had retired under orders from the commander-in-chief at New York, who thought both that post and the Virginian conquests in danger from the increasing activity of the Americans, and especially the French. Little had been done in the field by Cornwallis. He had been most gallantly watched, and even pursued by Lafayette, whose praises for skill, as well as heroism, rang far and wide. Washington and the French General Rochambeau joined Lafayette at Williamsburg, (September 14.) A great fleet under Count de Grasse was already in the Chesapeake. As soon as the land forces arrived, the siege of Yorktown was begun, (September 28.) The result was certain. Washington had contrived to leave Sir Henry Clinton impressed with the idea that New York was still the main object. Sir Henry, therefore, thought of no reënforcements for Cornwallis, until they were too late,

until, indeed, they were out of the question in consequence of the naval superiority of the French. In fact, an expedition to lay waste the eastern part of Connecticut was occupying Clinton's mind. He placed the loyalists and the Hessians despatched for the purpose under the traitor Arnold, who succeeded in destroying New London, (September.) Thus there were but seven thousand five hundred British at Yorktown to resist nine thousand Americans and seven thousand French, besides the numerous fleet. In less than three weeks, Cornwallis asked for terms, (October 17,) and two days afterwards surrendered.

Effect. The blow was decisive. The United States were transported. Government, army, people were for once united, for once elevated to the altitude of those noble spirits, who, like Washington, had sustained the nation until the moment of victory. "The play is over," wrote Lafayette, "and the fifth act is just finished." "O God!" exclaimed the English prime minister, on hearing of the event. "It is all over — all over!"

Prospects. It was Washington's earnest desire to avail of the French fleet in an attack on Charleston. De Grasse refused. Then Washington urged him to transport troops to Wilmington. But De Grasse alleged his engagements in the West Indies, and sailed thither. The French under Rochambeau went into winter quarters at Williamsburg, while the Americans marched, a part to reënforce the southern army, and a part to the various posts in the north. Prospects were uncertain. It was evident that the war was approaching its close, but none could tell how nearly. Washington implored his countrymen to be on the alert. Again and again he rebuked the inaction into which they were falling, as if their work was done. The British still held their post by the Penobscot. They were still strong at New York. Wilmington was evacuated by them; but

Charleston, the chief town of the south, and Savannah, remained in their hands. Lafayette wrote from France, whither he went at the close of the year, that "the evacuation of New York and Charleston are as far from British intentions as the evacuation of London."

Evacuation of the south.

It turned out differently. A vote of Parliament that the king be requested to bring the war to a close, (February 27, 1782,) led to a change of ministry. Determining to recognize the independence of the United States, and to concentrate hostilities against the European powers, the new ministry sent out Sir Guy Carleton as commander-in-chief, with instructions to evacuate New York, Charleston, and Savannah; in a word, the entire seaboard. Savannah was evacuated in the summer, (July 11,) Charleston in the early winter, (December 14.) It was the result of past campaigns, not of any present one. The Americans were without armies, without supplies, at least without such as were indispensable for any active operations. When the French under Rochambeau reached the American camp on the Hudson in the autumn, they passed between two lines of troops clothed and armed by subsidies from France. It was a touching tribute of gratitude, and an equally touching confession of weakness. All but a single corps of the French embarked at the close of the year. The remainder followed in the ensuing spring.

The European combatants.

Peace was then decided upon. It had been brought about by other operations besides those which have been described. The contest in America, indeed, was but an episode in the extended warfare of the period. Upon the sea, the fleets of Britain hardly encountered an American man-of-war. The opposing squadrons were those of France and Spain and Holland. By land, the French opposed the British in the East Indies, upon the coast of Africa, and in the West

Indies. They also aided the Spaniards to conquer Minorca, in the Mediterranean, and to assail, but in vain, the great stronghold of Gibraltar. The Spanish forces were also active in the Floridas. Holland, alone of the European combatants, made no stand against Great Britain. In the Indies, both East and West, and in South American Guiana, the Dutch were immense losers. What was gained from them, however, did not compensate for what was lost to others by the British. The preliminaries of peace, at first with America, (November 30,) and afterwards with the European powers, (January 20, 1783,) were signed to the general contentment of Great Britain, of Europe, and of America.

Cessation of hostilities.

Hostilities soon ceased. In America, Sir Guy Carleton proclaimed their cessation on the part of the British, (April 8.) Washington, with the consent of Congress, made proclamation to the same effect. By a singular coincidence, the day on which hostilities were stayed was the anniversary of that on which they were begun at Lexington, eight years before, (April 19.)

Release of prisoners.

Measures, already proposed by the British commander, were at once taken on both sides for the release of prisoners. The treatment and the exchange of these unfortunate men had given rise to great difficulties during the war. Even where actual cruelty did not exist, etiquette and policy were too strong for humanity. The horrors of the British jails and prison ships were bywords, and when their unhappy victims were offered in exchange for the better treated prisoners of the other side, the Americans hesitated to receive them. The troops that surrendered at Saratoga, on condition of a free passage to Great Britain, were detained, in consequence of various objections, to be freed only by desertions and slow exchanges after the lapse of years. In short, the prisoners

of both armies seem to have been regarded in the light of troublesome burdens, alike by those who had captured them and those from whom they were captured. Individual benevolence alone lights up the gloomy scene. At the close of the war, we find Congress, on the recommendation of Washington, voting its thanks to Reuben Harvey, a merchant of Cork, for his humane succors to the American prisoners in Ireland.

Treaties of peace.

Negotiations for peace met with many interruptions. So far as the United States were concerned, the questions of boundary, of the St. Lawrence and Newfoundland fisheries, of indemnity to British creditors, as well as to American loyalists, were all knotty points; the more so, that the four negotiators — Franklin, John Jay, John Adams, and Henry Laurens — were by no means agreed upon the principles by which to decide them. Some of the envoys, moreover, were possessed of the idea that France was disposed to betray her American allies; and so strong was this feeling that the consent of the French government, the point which had been agreed upon as the essential condition of making peace, was not even asked before the signature of the preliminaries already mentioned. It was before the preliminaries were signed that all these embarrassments appeared; and they continued afterwards. At length, however, definitive treaties were signed at Paris and at Versailles between Great Britain and her foes, (September 3.) * America obtained her independence, with all the accompanying privileges and possessions which she desired. She agreed, however, against her will, to make her debts good, and to recommend the loyalists, whose property had been confiscated, to the favor of the state governments. Spain recovered the Flor-

* The treaty with Holland was not concluded until the following spring.

idas. The other terms of the treaties — the cessions on one side and on the other — do not belong to our history. The treaty between Great Britain and the United States was formally confirmed by Congress at the beginning of the following year, (January 14, 1784.)

Evacuation of the north.

After long delays, the British withdrew from their post on the Penobscot. New York was evacuated, (November 25, 1783,) and ten days later, the remaining forces embarked from Staten Island and Long Island, (December 4–6.) A few western posts excepted, the territory of the United States was free.

Troubles in the American army.

The disposal of the American army had long been a serious question. A year before, the army had addressed Congress on the subject of the pay, then months, and even years, in arrears, (December, 1782.) Congress was powerless. The army was incensed. When, therefore, anonymous addresses to the officers were issued from the camp at Newburg, proposing the alternative of redress or of desertion,* the worst consequences appeared inevitable. The more so, that the excitement was greatest amongst the better class of soldiers, the "worthy and faithful men," as their commander described them, "who, from their early engaging in the war at moderate bounties, and from their patient continuance under innumerable distresses, have not only deserved well of their country, but have obtained an honorable distinction over those who, with shorter times, have gained large pecuniary rewards." Washington, and Washington alone, was equal to the crisis. He had repelled with unutterable disdain the offer of a crown from certain individuals in the army a year before, (May, 1782.) He now rebuked the spirit of the Newburg addresses, and by his majestic

* "If peace [comes], that nothing shall separate you from your arms but death; if war, that . . you will retire to some unsettled country."

integrity, quelled the rising passions of those around him. But he entered with all the greater fervor into the just claims of the army. His refusal at the outset of the war, renewed at the close,* to receive any compensation for his services to the country, placed him in precisely the position from which he could now appeal in behalf of his officers and soldiers to Congress and the nation. His voice was heard. The army obtained a promise of its pay, including the commutation to a fixed sum of the half pay for life formerly promised to the officers at the expiration of the war, (March, 1783.) All was not yet secure. But three months later, and a body of Pennsylvanian troops marched upon Congress itself in Philadelphia. Washington denounced the act with scorn. "These Pennsylvania levies," he says, "who have now mutinied, are recruits and soldiers of a day, who have not borne the heat and burden of the war." He at once sent a force to reduce and to chastise them, (June.)

Disbanding.

"It is high time for a peace," Washington had written some months previously. The army was slowly disbanded, a small number only being left when the formal proclamation of dissolution was made, (November 3.) A few troops were still retained in arms. Of these, and of his faithful officers, the commander-in-chief took his leave at New York, (December 4.) Thence he repaired to Annapolis, where Congress was in session, and there resigned the commission which he had held, unstained and glorious, for eight years and a half, (December 23.)

Government of the nation.

It seems as if he left no one behind him. The town and the state, each had its authorities; but the nation was without a government, at least with nothing more than the name of one. Yet the

* Just after resigning his commission, he declined the overtures of Pennsylvania to propose a national remuneration for his sacrifices.

need of a directing and a sustaining power had never been greater or clearer. If the war itself was over, its consequences, its burdens, its debts, its wasting influences, were but begun.

Washington's counsels.

No one saw this more plainly, no one felt it more deeply, than the retiring commander-in-chief. At no time had he been absorbed in his military duties. In his relations to Congress, to the states, even to the citizens, as well as in those to foreigners, whether allies or enemies, he had been almost as much the civil as the military head of the country. The arm that had led the nation through the field was now lifted to point out the paths that opened beyond. "According to the system of policy the states shall adopt at this moment," — thus Washington wrote to the governors of the states, on disbanding the army, — "they will stand or fall; and by their confirmation or lapse, it is yet to be decided whether the revolution must ultimately be considered as a blessing or a curse; a blessing or a curse, not to the present age alone, for with our fate will the destiny of unborn millions be involved." "There are four things," he continued, "which I humbly conceive are essential to the well being, I may even venture to say, to the existence, of the United States as an independent power.

"First. An indissoluble union of the states under one federal head.

"Second. A sacred regard to public justice.

"Third. The adoption of a proper peace establishment. And

"Fourth. The prevalence of that pacific and friendly disposition among the people of the United States which will induce them to forget their local prejudices and policies; to make those mutual concessions which are requisite to the general prosperity; and in some instances, to sacrifice their individual advantages to the interest of the community."

And prayers. "I now make it my earnest prayer," concluded the Christian hero, "that God would have you, and the state over which you preside, in His holy protection; that He would incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government, to entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another, for their fellow-citizens of the United States at large, and particularly for their brethren who have served them in the field; and finally, that He would most graciously be pleased to dispose us all to do justice, to love mercy, and to demean ourselves with that charity, humility, and pacific temper of mind, which were the characteristics of the divine Author of our blessed religion, and without a humble imitation of whose example in these things we can never hope to be a happy nation."

CHAPTER VI.

The Constitution.

Foreign sympathy.

One loves to dwell upon the sympathy from abroad for the infant nation. What had been repressed while the states were still claimed as the colonies of Great Britain broke forth after the claim was set aside. From all parts of Europe, from all parts of Great Britain itself, there came congratulations and applauses. Even sovereigns did homage to the republic. The King of France continued its friend. The King of Spain, recognizing its national existence, sent gifts and compliments to its great leader, Washington.

Lafayette's visit.

No proof of regard was dearer to Washington or to the nation than one which came from the friend and the champion of many years, the devoted Lafayette. He had spent two years and a half in generous exertions at home, when he crossed the seas to join in the American rejoicings at the definite establishment of independence. The whole people welcomed him. Divided on many points, they were united in the grateful affection which he had inspired. Soldiers and citizens, the wild borderers and the plodding townspeople, the inhabitants of every section, thronged together with a common desire of doing honor to Lafayette. He was feasted in all the principal places. Congress gave him a public reception. Washington crowned him with love and parental gratitude at Mount Vernon. After a six months' tour, he left America

to share in the struggles of his native country, (August, 1784—January, 1785.)

Wants of America. He left the country of his adoption in the midst of struggles of its own. It was contending against manifold wants, some common to any youthful nation, others peculiar to itself, to a nation so unique in its history, and especially in the history of the last twenty years. It is to these wants, and to the manner in which they were supplied, that we are to turn.

Organization. Chief of them all, the one, indeed, in which they will be found to have been comprehended, like segments in a circle, was organization. The sharp points, the intersecting lines, the clashing forms of different districts and of different institutions, needed to be reduced to order within the curve, at once enfolding and harmonizing, of a national system. There was hardly a political principle upon which the entire country agreed. There was not one political power by which it was governed. Interests were opposed to interests, classes to classes; nay, men to men. When the officers of the army, for instance, formed into a society, under the name of the Cincinnati, for the purpose of keeping up their relations with one another, and more particularly of succoring those who might fall into distress, a general uproar was raised, because the membership of the society was to be hereditary, from father to son, or from kinsman to kinsman. It was found necessary to strike out this provision, at the first general meeting of the Cincinnati, (1784.) Even then, though there remained nothing but a charitable association, it was inveighed against as a caste, as an aristocracy; as any thing, in short, save what it really was. It is easy to say that all this is a sign of republicanism, of a devoted anxiety to preserve the institutions for which loss and sufferings had been endured. But it is a clearer sign of the suspicions and the collisions

which were rending the nation asunder. There was but a single remedy. The people were to be united; the country was to be made one.

The states. Internal troubles

The states were absorbed in their own troubles. The debts of the Confederation lay heavy upon them, in addition to those contracted by themselves. Their citizens were impoverished, here and there maddened by the calamities and the burdens, private and public, which they were obliged to bear together. At Exeter, the assembly of New Hampshire was assailed by two hundred men with weapons, demanding an emission of paper money. All day, the insurgents held possession of the legislative chamber; but in the early evening, they were dispersed by a rumor that Exeter was taking up arms against them, (1786.) The same year, the courts of Massachusetts were prevented from holding their usual sessions by bodies of armed men, whose main object it was to prevent any collection of debts or taxes. So general was the sympathy with the movement, not only in Massachusetts, but in the adjoining states, that twelve or fifteen thousand were supposed to be ready to do the same. Nearly two thousand were in arms at the beginning of the following year, (1787.) The horror excited in the rest of the country was intense. Congress ordered troops to be raised, but as it had no power to interfere with the states, the pretext of Indian hostilities was set up. Massachusetts was fortunate in having James Bowdoin for a governor. Under his influence chiefly, — for the legislature was partly paralyzed and partly infected, — the danger was met. One or two thousand militia, under the command of General Lincoln, marched against the insurgents, at the head of whom was Daniel Shays, a captain in the continental army. Already driven back from Springfield, where they had attacked the arsenal, the insurgents retreated to

Petersham, and were there put to rout. Of all the prisoners, fourteen alone were tried and condemned, not one being executed. The insurrection had lasted about six months, (August, 1786—February, 1787.)

Dismemberments. Nor were such insurrections the only ones of the time. A body of settlers in Wyoming, principally emigrants from New England, held their land by grants from Connecticut, long the claimant of the territory. When Connecticut gave way to Pennsylvania, and the latter state insisted upon the necessity of new titles to the settlements of Wyoming, the settlers armed themselves, and threatened to set up a state of their own, (1782–87.) What was threatened there was actually executed elsewhere. The western counties of North Carolina, excited by being ceded to the United States, organized an independent government, as the state of Franklin or Frankland, (1784.) But the people were divided, and the governor, Colonel Sevier, of King's Mountain fame, was ultimately compelled to fly by the opponents of an independent organization, (1788.) Meanwhile old projects of independence had been revived in the Kentucky counties of Virginia. Petitions and resolutions led to acts of the Virginia legislature consenting to the independence of Kentucky on certain conditions, (1785–86.) Kentucky soon after petitioned Congress for admission to the Union, but without immediate effect, (1787–88.) All these instances of dismemberment, proposed or accomplished, relate to frontier settlements, where independence was suggested as much by the position as by the character of the settlers. But the older districts were stirred in the same way. Maine again and again strove to be detached from Massachusetts, (1786.)

Case of Vermont. The case of Vermont was one apart. It came up near the beginning of the war, when the inhabitants of that district, then known as the New Hampshire

grants, declared it the State of Vermont, (January, 1777,) and asked admission to the Union, (July.) The request was denied, on account of the claims of New York to the territory. A number of towns in the valley of the Connecticut, and partly within the limits of New Hampshire, afterwards formed themselves into the State of New Connecticut, (1779.) This soon fell through, leaving its predecessor, Vermont, to be enlarged by the New Hampshire towns on the eastern banks of the Connecticut, together with the New York settlements as far as the Hudson, (1781.) Overtures were then made to the British authorities in Canada, with whom the Vermonters might well wish to be on good terms, so long as they were excluded from the Union. Congress took alarm, as Vermont expected, and proposed to grant admission, provided the recent annexations from New Hampshire and New York were surrendered. This was done; but Congress still kept Vermont at a distance, (1782.) A member of the body, James Madison, explains the reasons why a promise, so long delayed, was finally violated. The Eastern States, except New Hampshire, and the Central States, except New York, advocated the entrance of Vermont, while New York and the Southern States opposed it, as Mr. Madison relates, through "first, an habitual jealousy of a predominance of eastern interests; secondly, the opposition expected from Vermont to western claims; thirdly, the inexpediency of admitting so unimportant a state to an equal vote in deciding a peace, and all the other grand interests of the Union now depending; fourthly, the influence of the example on a premature dismemberment of the other states." So Vermont remained aloof, contented, one may believe, to be free from the troubles of the United States.

The strife exhibited in the case of Vermont was nothing new or temporary. Disputes between state and state arose,

Disputes between state and state.

as we have had occasion to observe, in the midst of war, and peace had not put them to rest. When Mr. Madison speaks of sectional interests, he alludes to the varieties of occupation and of investment which distinguished one state from another. Such things could not but lead to different systems in different parts of the country, the more so, especially in the north and in the south, that there were differences of character, and even of principle, to enhance the differences of pursuits or of possessions. The allusion to the western territory is to a subject already noticed in our pages. Partially settled at the time when the Confederation was completed, the question of the unoccupied lands was still undecided. It united the smaller states, as a general rule, against the larger ones, by whom the western regions were claimed. Besides these great divisions between north and south, and between the larger and the smaller states, there were others of more limited nature. Boundary questions came up, some to be determined, and others to be left undetermined, but none to subside immediately. Variances as to the share of the national debt, and more particularly as to the method of meeting it, endured from year to year. In short, the thirteen states, instead of being intertwined, were set against one another on almost every point of importance that arose amongst them.

General government.

The general government continued in the same feeble state that has been repeatedly observed. If there was any change, it was that the Confederation and its Congress had sunk to a still lower degree of inefficiency. There was even less attention to its wants on the part of the states; its requisitions went almost unanswered, their obligations almost unregarded. The superintendent of finance, Robert Morris, of Philadelphia, by whose personal exertions and advances the country had been forced through the last

years of the war, laid down his office in despair, after a year of peace. His creation of a bank — the Bank of North America (1781) — was recommended by Congress to the states, with the request that branches should be established; but in vain. Congress renewed its petition, as it may be styled, for power to lay a duty on imports, if only for a limited period, (1783.) After long delay, a fresh appeal was made with really piteous representations of the national insolvency. New York refused to comply upon the terms proposed, and Congress was again humiliated, (1786.) During its efforts on this point, Congress had roused itself upon another, and asked for authority over foreign commerce. Such was the urgency of the interests at stake, that Congress went so far as to appoint a commission for the purpose of negotiating commercial treaties with the European powers, (1784.) * But the supplications of Congress to the states were once more denied, (1784–86.)

Organization of the northwest territory.

On one point alone was Congress worthy to be called a government. It organized the western territory, after having prevailed upon the states, or most of them, to abandon their pretensions to regions so remote from themselves. Virginia having followed the earlier example of New York, a plan was brought forward by one of her delegates, Thomas Jefferson, for the division and constitution of the western territory. The plan, at first, embraced the organization of the entire western territory, out of which seventeen states, all free, were to be formed. The proposed prohibition of slavery was at once voted down; otherwise the project was adopted,

* A treaty was made with only one of them, (Prussia,) but it contained substance enough for a score of old treaties, in prohibiting privateering, and sustaining the liberty of neutral commerce in case of war, (1785.) See the next chapter.

(April, 1784.) But the cessions of the states not yet covering the whole of the region thus apportioned, its organization was postponed until the national title to the lands could be made complete. Massachusetts (1785) and Connecticut (1786) ceded their claims, the latter state, however, with a reservation. Treaties with various tribes disposed in part of the Indian titles to the western territories, (1784–86.) * All these cessions completing the hold of the nation upon the tract north-west of the Ohio,† that country was definitely organized as the North-west Territory, by an ordinance of Congress, (July 13, 1787) This intrusted the government of the territory partly to officers appointed by Congress, and partly to an assembly to be chosen by the settlers as soon as they amounted to five thousand; the inhabitants and the authorities being alike bound to the observance of certain articles of compact between the old states and the new ones that might arise within the territory. These articles provided for religious liberty; for habeas corpus, trial by jury, and kindred privileges; for the encouragement of religion and education, and for justice towards the Indians; for the equal rights and responsibilities of the new states and the old; for the division of the territory into states; and lastly, for the prohibition of slavery. Under so liberal an organization, surveys, sales, and settlements followed fast. A colony from Massachusetts was the first to occupy Ohio, at Marietta, (1788.)

Difficulties with Spain.

Singular enough, while Congress was taking these steps to preserve the western domains, it was taking others to endanger them. Eager to secure a treaty

* It was many years before the Indian title was completely extinguished

† The south-west territory, though ceded in great part by the Indians, was not yet ceded by the states on whose borders it lay. South Carolina was the first to give up her claims, (August, 1787.)

of commerce with Spain, the Northern and Central States assented to surrender the navigation of the Mississippi to that power, (1786.) In this they had no less an authority upon their side than Washington, who appears to have attached more importance to internal communication between the west and the east alone than to that wider intercourse which the west would possess by means of its mighty river. Jefferson, then the American minister at Paris, was farther sighted. "The act," he wrote, "which abandons the navigation of the Mississippi, is an act of separation between the eastern and western country," (1787.) Suppose the right to the Mississippi waived, even for a limited period, and the probability is, that a large number of the western settlers, conceiving themselves sacrificed, would have separated from their countrymen, and gained a passage through the stream either in war or in alliance with Spain.

And Great Britain.

Relations with Great Britain were still more disturbed than those with Spain. Nor were they less threatening to the west. The treaty of peace exacted the surrender of the western posts by Britain. But America was required at the same time to provide for the debts of great magnitude due to British merchants. This, however, was not done. Congress was unable, and the states were unwilling, to effect any thing; five states, indeed, continuing or commencing measures to prevent the collection of British debts. When, therefore, John Adams, the first minister to Great Britain, entered into a negotiation for the recovery of the posts which the British still held, he was met at once by the demand that the American part in the treaty should be fulfilled, (1786.) The subject of debts was not the only one on which the states were violating the treaty. But it was the chief infraction; and against it chiefly was directed a remonstrance which Congress addressed to the states, altogether in vain, (1787.)

Dark times.

"The consideration felt for America by Europe," wrote Lafayette, "is diminishing to a degree truly painful; and what has been gained by the revolution is in danger of being lost little by little, at least during an interval of trial to all the friends of the nation." "I am mortified beyond expression," wrote Washington, "when I view the clouds that have spread over the brightest morn that ever dawned upon any country."

Old foundations.

Amid this tottering of the national system, the old foundations stood secure. The laws that had been laid deep in the past, the institutions, political and social, that had been reared above them, remained to support the present uncertainties. Every strong principle of the mother country, every broad reform of the colonies, contributed to the strength and the development of the struggling nation.

Recent superstructures.

Nor were recent superstructures wanting. The states, in forming and reforming their constitutions, set up many a great principle, undeveloped, if not unknown, in earlier times. Nothing, for instance, could be more novel, as well as more admirable, than the indemnity * voted by Pennsylvania to the proprietary family of which she had cast off the dominion. It was a recognition of rights belonging to rulers, that had never been made by subjects in a successful revolution. The law of inheritance was another point of new proportions. The claim of the eldest son to a double share of his father's property, if not to all the prerogatives of primogeniture, was gradually prohibited, Georgia taking the lead. Suffrage was extended in several states,† from holders of real

* £130,000 sterling, in addition to all the private domains of the family. Maryland made no such indemnity; but the representative of her proprietor was an illegitimate son

† New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Delaware, South Carolina, and, partially, North Carolina

or personal property to all tax-paying freemen. Personal liberty obtained extension and protection. The class of indented servants diminished. That of slaves disappeared altogether in some of the states. Massachusetts, declaring men free and equal by her Bill of Rights, was pronounced by her Supreme Court to have put an end to slavery within her limits, (1780–83.) Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Connecticut forbade the importation of slaves, and the bondage of any persons thereafter born upon their soil. Other states declared against the transportation of slaves from state to state, others against the foreign slave trade; all, in fine, moving with greater or less energy in the same direction, save only South Carolina and Georgia. Societies were formed in many places to quicken the action of the authorities. In making exertions, and in maintaining principles like these, the nation was proving its title to independence.

Religious privileges.

Nothing, however, was more full of promise than the religious privileges to which the states consented. Rhode Island, who, as formerly mentioned, had no disposition to change her existing institutions, made one alteration by striking out the prohibitory statute against Roman Catholics, (1784.) But Rhode Island was no longer alone in her glory. The majority of the state constitutions allowed entire religious liberty. The only real restrictions upon it were those to which the Puritan states still clung in enforcing the payment of taxes, and the attendance upon services in some church or other; the old leaven not having entirely lost its power. Particular forms of faith were here and there required, if not from the citizens, at any rate from the magistrates; Roman Catholics being excluded from office in several states of the north, the centre, and the south.

As there was no single fold into which the Christians of

Ecclesiastical organizations.

the United States would enter, it was of the highest importance that their separate folds should be marked out and governed upon definite principles. Nothing else was likely to prevent collision among the more zealous, or straying away among the more lukewarm. The American branch of the church of England, deserted by the loyalists, and suspected, if not assailed, by the patriots, had but just survived the revolutionary struggle. It obtained its first bishop, Samuel Seabury, by ordination in Scotland, (1784,) his first associates, White and Provoost, being consecrated in England, (1787.) A convention of several states at New York declared their church the Protestant Episcopal church of the United States, (1784.) The Methodist Episcopal church, strongest in the centre and the south, obtained its first bishop, Thomas Coke, (1784.) Two years afterwards, the first Roman Catholic bishop, John Carroll, was appointed to the see of Baltimore, (1786.) The Presbyterians then formed their synods for the Central and the Southern States, (1788.) In the north, the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists, uniting to a certain degree, continued their ancient institutions. All over the country, ecclesiastical systems were reducing themselves to form and law.

Suggestions of a national Constitution.

It was time for the nation to profit by the examples and the principles that have been enumerated, — time for it to guard against the conflicts and the perils that have been described. Alexander Hamilton, as mentioned in a former chapter, conceived the idea of a Convention for forming a national Constitution as early as 1780. Other individuals advocated the same measure, in private or in public. The legislature of New York supported it in 1782. The legislature of Massachusetts supported it in 1785.

In the spring of the same year, (1785,) a number of

Conventions at Alexandria and Annapolis.

commissioners from Maryland and Virginia assembled at Alexandria, for the purpose of regulating the navigation of the Chesapeake and the Potomac. They also met at Mount Vernon. James Madison was one of their number, and he suggested the appointment of commissioners with additional powers to act, with the assent of Congress, in organizing a tariff for the two states. This being recommended by the commission at Alexandria, the Virginia legislature enlarged the plan, by appointing commissioners to meet others, not only from Maryland, but from all the states, and "to take into consideration the trade of the United States." Five states were represented in a Convention at Annapolis in the autumn of the following year, (1786.) They were wise enough to see two things: one, that five states could not act for the whole; and the other, that the subject of trade was but a drop in the ocean of difficulties with which the nation was threatened. At the proposal of Alexander Hamilton, one of the commissioners, and the same who had urged the formation of a Constitution six years before, the Convention at Annapolis recommended a national convention at Philadelphia in the ensuing month of May, "to take into consideration the situation of the United States, to devise such further provisions as shall appear necessary to render the Constitution of the federal government adequate to the exigencies of the Union, and to report such an act for that purpose to the United States in Congress assembled, as, when agreed to by them, and afterwards confirmed by the legislature of every state, will effectually provide for the same."

Action of Virginia.

The first to act upon this proposal from Annapolis was the state so often foremost in the cause of the country. Thus spoke Virginia: "The General Assembly of this commonwealth, taking into view the actual

situation of the Confederacy, . . . can no longer doubt that the crisis is arrived at which the good people of America are to decide the solemn question whether they will, by wise and magnanimous efforts, reap the just fruits of that independence which they have so gloriously acquired, and of that union which they have cemented with so much of their common blood, or whether, by giving way to unmanly jealousies and prejudices, or to partial and transitory interests, they will renounce the auspicious blessings prepared for them by the revolution. . . . The same noble and extended policy, and the same fraternal and affectionate sentiments which originally determined the citizens of this commonwealth to unite with their brethren of the other states in establishing a federal government, cannot but be felt with equal force now, as motives to lay aside every inferior consideration, and to concur in such further concessions and provisions as may be necessary to secure the great objects for which that government was instituted, and to render the United States as happy in peace as they have been glorious in war." Thereupon the legislature appointed its deputies to join with those of the other states "in devising and discussing all such alterations and provisions as may be necessary to render the Federal Constitution adequate to the exigencies of the Union."

Of other states and of Congress.

The noble example thus set was at once followed by New Jersey, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, and Delaware. By the time these states declared themselves, (February, 1787,) Congress, after many doubts as to the propriety of the course, came out with a call of its own. Instead, however, of taking the broad ground on which Virginia set herself, Congress limited its summons to a convention "for the sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation." The other states, Rhode Island excepted, went on to appoint their del-

egates. The credentials of some representations supported the liberal views of Virginia; those of others the narrower purpose of Congress. Only one state, Delaware, laid its representatives under a positive restriction, namely, to maintain the right of the state, the smallest but one in the Union, to an equal vote in any government that might be framed.

Opening of the Convention.

The same hall in which the Declaration of Independence had been adopted, more than eleven years before, and in which Congress had continued to sit during the greater part of the intervening period, in the State House at Philadelphia, was chosen for the sessions of the Convention. The day fixed for the opening arrived. "Such members as were in town" — runs the diary of Washington, who had consented, against his inclination, to sit in the Convention — "assembled at the State House; but only two states being represented, namely, Virginia and Pennsylvania, agreed to meet to-morrow," (May 14, 1787.) It must have been with anxious thoughts that the few who met found themselves obliged to separate day after day, without being able to make so much as a beginning in the work before them. At length, eleven days after the appointed time, the representatives of seven states — a bare majority — assembled and opened the Convention. As a matter of course, George Washington was elected president, (May 25.)

Aspect.

The United States of America never wore a more majestic aspect than in the Convention, which gradually * filled up with the delegates of every state except Rhode Island. The purpose of the assembly was sufficient to invest it with solemnity. To meet in the design of strengthening instead of enfeebling authority, of forming a

* New Hampshire was not represented till July 23.

government which should enable the nation to fulfil, instead of eluding its obligations alike to the citizen and the stranger, — to meet with these intentions was to do what the world had never witnessed. It is scarcely necessary to say that lower motives entered in; that the interests of classes and of sections, the prejudices of narrow politicians and of selfish men, obtruded themselves with ominous strength. Many of the members were altogether unequal to the national duties of the Convention. But they were surrounded by others of a nobler mould — by the venerable Franklin, lately returned from his French mission, the representative of the later colonial days; by various members of the Stamp Act Congress, of the Congress that declared independence, and of the subsequent Congresses before and during the Confederation; by several representatives of the younger class of patriots, notably by Alexander Hamilton and James Madison, who had been conspicuous in the movements preliminary to the Convention; and by many more whose names do not depend upon a volume like the present for reverential recollection.

Plans of a constitution.

The rules of the Convention ordered secrecy of debate and the right of each state to an equal vote. Governor Randolph, of Virginia, then opened the deliberations upon a constitution by offering a series of resolutions proposing a national legislature of two branches, a national executive, and a national judiciary of supreme and inferior tribunals. Charles C. Pinckney, of South Carolina, offered a sketch of government, based on the same principles as Randolph's, but developed with greater detail. Both the plans were referred to a committee of the whole; but Randolph's, or the Virginia plan, as it was rightly called, engrossed the debate. At the end of a fortnight the committee reported in favor of the Virginia system. Things had not gone so far without opposition, to the ele-

ments of which we will revert immediately. On the report of the committee, a new plan was offered by William Patterson, of New Jersey, embodying the views of the Connecticut, New York, Delaware, and Maryland, as well as the New Jersey delegations. This New Jersey plan, so styled, proposed a government of much more limited powers than that of the Virginia pattern. The two were referred to a committee of the whole. Soon after, Alexander Hamilton broached a plan of his own, going to the very opposite extreme of the New Jersey system. He was for taking the British constitution as "the best model the world has ever produced," and for creating a national government, of which the executive and the higher branch of the legislature, as well as the judiciary, should all be elected to serve during good behavior or life. Hamilton presented his plan as an exposition of his personal convictions rather than as a subject for debate, confessing that it was "very remote from the idea of the people." The question, therefore, lay between the Virginia and the New Jersey plans.

Question of powers.

But there was another question to be previously decided, if not by formal vote, at least by the course of opinions. Doubt existed about the powers of the Convention. Some insisted that it could do no more than revise the Articles of the Confederation; in other words, that it might reform, but not displace, the existing government. These members were of course the supporters of the New Jersey plan. They called it by the name of federal, in opposition to the system, at the time styled anti-federal, of their opponents. The anti-federal — that is, the national men — maintained the necessity of a new government as sufficient to authorize the Convention to frame one, even if the power to do so had not been expressly given. They urged this the more, in that the Convention would not create the government, but simply recommend its creation

to the nation. The difference between the two sides was, as we see, immense. As the one or as the other prevailed, so followed the fate not merely of the Virginia and the New Jersey plans, but of the Constitution and the nation.

A national system adopted.

It was, therefore, a turning point in the movements of the Convention, when the committee of the whole reported once more in favor of the Virginia plan. The labors of construction and of detail were all to be gone through. But the one guiding and assuring principle of a national system was gained, (June 29.)

Parties: small states and large states.

Parties were by this time but too distinctly defined. The federal side was taken, as a general rule, by the representatives of the small states, the national by those of the large. Whatever was upheld by the large states, especially Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and, above all, Virginia, was, as if for this simple reason, opposed by the small ones. There was a constant dread of the dominion which, it was supposed, would be exercised by the superior states to the disadvantage and the disgrace of those of inferior rank. Perhaps the tone assumed by the large states was such as reasonably to inspire suspicion. Certain it is, that the breach between the two parties grew wider and wider, particularly when the committee and the Convention pronounced in favor of the national plan. Within ten days afterwards, Franklin, shocked by the altercations around him, moved that prayers should be said every morning. The motion was parried, partly, it was said, to prevent the public from surmising the divisions of the Convention.

Views of state government.

The starting point, so far as theory was concerned, of the two parties, was the government by states. In this, the federal members argued, resides the only principle of sovereignty, and to this recourse must be had for the life and breath of a government for the

nation. Hence the name of federal, implying the support of a league — that is, a league between the states — as the true form of a general government. All this the national party opposed. We are not met, they reasoned, to fashion a Constitution out of the states or for the states, but to create a Constitution for the people; it is the people, not the states, who are to be governed and united; it is the people, moreover, from whom the power required for the Constitution is to emanate. At the same time, the national members, with a few exceptions, were far from denying the excellence of state governments. These, they urged, are precisely what we want to manage the local affairs of the different portions of the country; in this capacity, the states will be truly the pillars of the Union.

Votes of states.

These views had entered largely into the debates already decided by the adoption of a national plan for the Constitution. They were again brought forward, and with renewed earnestness, in relation to a question now coming up for decision. Before the Confederation, and after it, the votes of the states in Congress had been equal, each state having a single vote, and no more. This was the rule, as has been mentioned, of the Convention. But when the point was reached in the constitutional debates, the national party insisted upon an entirely different system. The votes to be taken in the legislative branches of the new government are not, it was asserted, the votes of the states, but the votes of the people; let them, therefore, be given according to the numbers of the people, not of the states. Not so, replied the federal members, — and they had reason to be excited, for it was from apprehension on this very point that they had opposed the national plan, — not so, they replied, or our states, with their scanty votes, will be utterly absorbed in the larger states. One of the small states, Delaware, sent her representatives, as may

be remembered, with express instructions to reserve her equal vote in the national legislature. But the federal party, already disappointed, found itself doomed to a fresh disappointment. Abandoning, or intimating that it was willing to abandon, the claim of an equal vote in both branches of the legislature, it stood the firmer for equality in one of the branches — the Senate of the Constitution. Even this more moderate demand was disregarded by the majority, intent upon unequal votes in both the branches.

Agitation. Great agitation followed. "We will sooner submit to foreign power!" cried a representative from one of the small states. But for the reference of the matter to a committee, who, at the instance of Franklin, adopted a compromise, making the votes of the states equal in the Senate, the work of the Convention would have come to a sudden close. As it was, the report of the committee hardly allayed the tumultuous passions that had been aroused. It but partly satisfied the small states, while it kindled the wrath of the large, secure as these thought themselves, upon the point which they were now required to yield. "If no compromise should take place," asked Elbridge Gerry, of Massachusetts, "what will be the consequence? A secession will take place, for some gentlemen seem decided on it." It was the federal party that talked of secession. The national party, no wiser, as a whole, spoke of the dismemberment and absorption of the smaller states, hinting at the sword. Two of the New York delegation, incensed or dejected by the triumphant course of the national members, deserted the Convention. "We were on the verge of dissolution," said Luther Martin, a member from Maryland, "scarce held together by the strength of a hair." Fortunately, peace prevailed. The compromise was accepted, and both national and federal members united in determining on an equal vote in the Senate and an unequal vote in the House that were to be.

Parties: north and south.

Another division besides that between the large and the small states had now appeared. It separated the north from the south. How many reasons there were for the separation has been remarked; but the reason of all, the one so strong as to lead men to acknowledge that the division between the north and the south was wider than any other in the Convention, — the great reason was slavery. This system, pierced, if not overthrown, in all the Northern and in some of the Central States, was still cherished in the south. The scanty numbers of the free population in the Southern States seemed to make slaves a necessity there.

Apportionment of representation.

The first struggle upon the point arose with respect to the apportionment of representation. It was to be decided how the people were to be represented, in what proportions, and in what classes. Upon this subject all other questions yielded to one, namely, whether slaves should be included with freemen, not, of course, as voting, but as making up the number entitled to representation. The extreme party of the south said that they must be, and on the same terms, being equally valuable as the free laborers of the north. On the other hand, the extreme party of the north declared that slaves should never be taken into account until they were emancipated, as they ought to be. The necessity for compromise was again evident. The moderate members of either side came together, and agreed that three fifths of the slave population should be enumerated with the whole of the white population in apportioning the representatives amongst the different states.

The slave trade.

A graver point was raised. In the draught of the Constitution now under debate, there stood a clause forbidding the general government to lay any tax or prohibition upon the migrations or the importations authorized

by the states. This signified that there was to be no interference with the slave trade. "It is inconsistent," exclaimed Martin, of Maryland, "with the principles of the revolution, and dishonorable to the American character, to have such a feature in the Constitution!" "Religion and humanity," answered John Rutledge, of South Carolina, "have nothing to do with this question. Interest alone is the governing principle of nations. The true question at present is, whether the Southern States shall or shall not be parties to the Union." Charles C. Pinckney, calmer than his colleague, took broader ground. "If the states be left at liberty on this subject, South Carolina may perhaps by degrees do of herself what is wished, as Virginia and Maryland have already done." The opposition to the claims of the extreme south came from the Central States, especially from Virginia, not from the north. The north, intent upon the passage of acts protective of its large shipping interests, was quite ready to come to an understanding with the south. The consequence was that, instead of imitating the example of earlier years and declaring the slave trade at an end, the Convention protracted its existence for twenty years, (till 1808.) At the same time, the restriction upon acts relating to commerce was stricken from the Constitution. Dark as this transaction seems, it was still a compromise. To extend the slave trade for twenty years was far better than to leave it without any limit at all. It was at the close of these discussions that the draught of the clause respecting fugitive slaves was introduced, and accepted without discussion. The word *slaves*, however, was avoided here, as it had been in all the portions of the Constitution relating to slavery.

Details and discussions.

There is no occasion in this place for dwelling upon the details and the discussions of the Convention. Wherever there was a detail, there was al-

most invariably a discussion; but the interest in the debates generally was altogether subordinate to that excited by the questions which have been mentioned. On these, as the questions involving compromise, it was felt that the Constitution depended. "The Constitution which we now present" — thus ran the draught of a letter proposed to be addressed to Congress — "is the result of a spirit of amity and of that mutual deference and concession which the peculiarity of our political situation rendered indispensable." "I can well recollect," said James Wilson to his constituents of Pennsylvania, "the impression which on many occasions was made by the difficulties which surrounded and pressed the Convention. The great undertaking sometimes seemed to be at a stand; and other times its motions seemed to be retrograde."

Adoption of the Constitution.

At length, after nearly four months' perseverance through all the heat of summer, the Convention agreed to the Constitution, (September 15.) As soon as it could be properly engrossed, it was signed by all the delegates, save Gerry, of Massachusetts, — who hinted at civil war being about to ensue, — Randolph and George Mason, of Virginia, (September 17.) As the last members were signing, Franklin pointed to a sun painted upon the back of the president's chair, saying, "I have often and often, in the course of the session and the vicissitude of my hopes and fears as to its issue, looked at that sun behind the president, without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting; but now, at length, I have the happiness to know that it is a rising and not a setting sun."

Opposition in the nation.

The dawn was still uncertain. Presented to Congress, and thence transmitted to the states, to be by them accepted or rejected, the Constitution was received with very general murmurs. Even some members of the Convention, on reaching home, declared,

like Martin, of Maryland, "I would reduce myself to indigence and poverty, . . . if on those terms only I could procure my country to reject those chains which are forged for it." The words imply the chief cause of the opposition excited throughout the nation. It was thought that the Constitution was too strong, that it exalted the powers of the government too high, and depressed the rights of the states and the people too low. This was the opinion of the anti-federalists — a name borne rather than assumed by those who had constituted, or by those who succeeded to, the federal party in the Convention. On the other side stood the federalists, the national party of the Convention, with their adherents throughout the country. But the names, like most party names, rather obscured than explained the relations of those to whom they were attached. The federalists were no advocates of a simple league between the states. Nor were the anti-federalists the opponents of such a league, but, on the contrary, its supporters. They opposed, not the union, but what they called the subjection of the states, proposed by the Constitution.

Constitutional writings.

One who acted for the Constitution at the time, and who wrote of it in after years, — Jeremy Belknap, then a clergyman of Boston, — tells a story illustrating the changing tempers of the period. A man has a new pair of small-clothes brought home to him. "It is too small here, says he, and wants to be let out; it is too big here, and wants to be taken in. I am afraid there will be a hole there, and you must put on a patch; this button is not strong enough — you must set on another." But, taking his wife's advice, he tried on the garment, and found himself satisfied. The constitutional writings, as they may be called, of the twelvemonth succeeding the Convention, were far in advance of any preceding productions of America. The greatness of the cause called forth new powers of

mind, nay, new powers of heart. Washington's letters upon the subject overflow with emotions such as his calm demeanor had seldom betrayed before. Under the signature of Publius, Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay united in the composition of the Federalist. It was a succession of essays, some profound in argument, others thrilling in appeal, and all devoted to setting forth the principles and foretelling the operations of the Constitution. Under the signature of Fabius, John Dickinson — the same whose Farmer's Letters had pleaded for liberty twenty years before — now pleaded for constitutional government. It was not merely the Constitution that was thus rendered clear and precious. The subject was as wide as the rights of man.

Adoption by the states.

So strong and so wise exertion was not in vain. State after state, beginning with Delaware, (December 7, 1787,) assented to the Constitution, some by large, some by exceedingly small majorities. In most of the bodies by which the ratification was declared, a series of amendments was framed and passed. North Carolina assented only on condition of her amendments being adopted. In one of the state Conventions, New York, the recommendation of another general Convention was pressed upon the nation. New York was the scene of more decided demonstrations. The list of what can be called riots throughout the country, at the time, begins and ends with a collision between two bands of the rival parties, at Albany, and the destruction of the type in an anti-federalist newspaper establishment at New York, (July 4–27, 1788.) The project of a second Convention found favor in Pennsylvania. It was then taken up by the assembly of Virginia, but after the Convention of that state had accepted the Constitution. In seeing these states arrayed in greater or less strength against the Constitution, one is struck by their

being large states, to which the Constitution was supposed to be particularly acceptable. The other of the largest states, Massachusetts, had but a bare majority to give in favor of the Constitution. On the other hand, several of the small states were now the most earnest supporters of federalist principles. The causes of this revolution were chiefly local. But, actuated by different motives, the large states, or rather the parties in the large states, opposing the unconditional adoption of the Constitution, were unable to combine with any effect. The generous impulses and the united exertions of their opponents carried the day. Only North Carolina and Rhode Island stood aloof, and the former but partially, when Congress performed the last act preliminary to the establishment of the Constitution, by appointing days for the requisite elections and for the organization of the new government, (September 13, 1788.)

Character of the transaction.

Thus was completed the most extraordinary transaction of which merely human history bears record. A nation enfeebled, dismembered, and dispirited, broken by the losses of war, by the dissensions of peace, incapacitated for its duties to its own citizens or to foreign powers, suddenly bestirred itself and prepared to create a government. It chose its representatives without conflicts or even commotions. They came together, at first only to disagree, to threaten, and to fail. But against the spells of individual selfishness and sectional passion, the inspiration of the national cause proved potent. The representatives of the nation consented to the measures on which the common honor and the common safety depended. Then the nation itself broke out in clamors. Still there was no violence, or next to none. No sort of contention arose between state and state. Each had its own differences, its own hesitations; but when each had decided for itself, it joined the rest and proclaimed the Constitution.

Sympathy for mankind.

The work thus achieved was not merely for the nation that achieved it. In the midst of their doubts and their dangers, a few generous spirits, if no more, gathered fresh courage by looking beyond the limits of their country. Let Washington speak for them. "I conceive," says he, "under an energetic general government, such regulations might be made, and such measures taken, as would render this country the asylum of pacific and industrious characters from all parts of Europe," — "a kind of asylum," as he says in another place, "for mankind." It was not, therefore, for America alone that her sons believed themselves to have labored, but for the world.

Literature of the revolution and the Constitution.

It has already appeared that the writings of the soldiers and the statesmen of the period were, in many instances, as important as their actions. There were other writers, who stood conspicuous, solely or almost solely, on account of their literary exertions. Such was Thomas Paine, an Englishman, whose pamphlet of Common Sense (1776) had so great an effect that its author, though then but a few months in the country, pretended afterwards to have started the revolution. His later pamphlets, issued during the war under the name of the Crisis, were of equal power. Amongst the American authors were John Trumbull, of Connecticut, whose poem of McFingal (begun 1774) was a satire at once upon his countrymen and upon their foes; Francis Hopkinson, of Philadelphia, who, after various productions in prose and in rhyme relating to the war, came to the aid of the Constitution in an allegory entitled the New Roof; and Philip Freneau, of New York, whose verses upon the battles of the revolution were amongst the most popular and the most artistic compositions of the times. The influence of such a literature may be conceived. It spread the stirring spirit of the camp and of the council around the fireside and

within the closet, kindling sympathy, arousing action, and thus contributing largely to the national redemption.

The music of Billings.

Nor should we forget, in this connection, the influence of the first of our composers, William Billings, a Bostonian. Such was his enthusiasm at once for his art and for his country, that, though almost uneducated as a musician, he moved many a spirit by his ardent strains. His melodies were heard on the march and on the battle field as well as in the choir; such as his Independence and his Columbia may be called psalms of the revolution and of the Constitution.

CHAPTER VII.

Washington's Administration.

Washington president.

The name of Washington was almost a part of the Constitution. "The Constitution would never have been adopted," — thus Edmund Randolph, by no means a strong adherent to Washington, wrote to him afterwards, — "but from a knowledge that you had once sanctioned it, and an expectation that you would execute it." "The Constitution," Lafayette wrote at once from Paris, "satisfies many of our desires; but I am much mistaken if there are not some points that would be perilous, had not the United States the happiness of possessing their guardian angel, who will lead them to whatever still remains to be done before reaching perfection." Such was the universal voice of the nation, and of the nation's well wishers. The presidential electors gave in their votes without a single exception in favor of Washington; and he consented to what he had reason to call "this last great sacrifice." "I bade adieu to Mount Vernon," he writes in his diary, "to private life, and to domestic felicity; and with a mind oppressed with more anxious and painful sensations than I have words to express, set out with the best disposition to render service to my country in obedience to its call, but with less hope of answering its expectations."

The two houses of Congress had been organized in New

Organization of government.

York, after a month's delay.* A day or two before Washington's arrival, John Adams took his place as vice president. The inauguration of the president, postponed a few days after he was ready for the ceremony, at length completed the organization of the government, (April 30, 1789.)

Solemnity of the work.

It was one thing for Washington to receive the homages of his countrymen, on his journey to the seat of government, and on his entrance into office there; all this was smiling to the eye, and full of promise to the ear. But it was another thing to remember the weaknesses and the divisions of the nation; to behold the present sources of peril; and to feel that the Constitution was still an untried instrument, unmoved, perhaps unmovable. Whatever has been said of the solemnity of former periods, or of former duties, must be repeated with stronger emphasis of the work now before Washington and his coadjutors. Of far greater difficulty than the formation of the Constitution was the setting it in operation. Washington knew it all. And almost the first words which broke from his lips, as president of the United States, were words of prayer. "It would be peculiarly improper," he said at the beginning of his inaugural speech, "to omit in this first official act my fervent supplications to that Almighty Being who rules over the universe, who presides in the councils of nations, and whose providential aids can supply every human defect, that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States, a government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes, and may enable every instrument employed in its

* March 4 being the appointed day; and the House not having a quorum till March 30, the Senate none till April 6.

administration to execute with success the functions allotted to his charge."

Washington to his fellow-Christians.

In the same spirit Washington invoked the support of those around him, not merely as his fellow-countrymen, but as his fellow-Christians. Among all the addresses hailing his accession to the presidency, from political and industrial, from literary and scientific bodies, none seemed to please him more than those received from religious organizations. In his replies, he remarks upon his need of their sympathies and prayers. Convinced that nothing could so bind the nation together as charity amongst the different branches of Christians, he insists upon it with peculiar earnestness. In an address to his own church, the Protestant Episcopal, he expresses his joy "to see Christians of different denominations dwell together in more charity, and conduct themselves in respect to each other with a more Christian-like spirit, than ever they have done in any former age or in any other nation." To the church that had been an object of persecution through the whole colonial period, the Roman Catholic, the president wrote as follows: "I hope ever to see America among the foremost nations in examples of justice and liberality. And I presume that your fellow-citizens will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of their revolution, and the establishment of their government."

The nation.

These principles, so far above any of a merely political character, were to be applied to a nation now numbering nearly four millions.* This was the population of all the thirteen states. The Constitution, as will be recollected, went into operation with the assent of but

* The census of 1790 gave, whites, 3,172,464; free blacks, 59,466; slaves, 697,897: total, 3,929,827.

eleven. North Carolina acceded in eight months, (November 13;) Rhode Island in fifteen, (May 29, 1790.)

Work of Congress. The departments and the judiciary.

The great feature of the opening years of Washington's administration was the work of Congress, the body upon whose laws the government depended for movement, if not for life. The departments were organized; one of state, one of the treasury, and one of war; each being under the control of a secretary. The three secretaries, with an attorney general, constituted the cabinet of the president; the postmaster general not being a cabinet officer until a later period. Washington appointed Thomas Jefferson the first secretary of state, Alexander Hamilton the first secretary of the treasury, Henry Knox the first secretary of war, Edmund Randolph the first attorney general, and Samuel Osgood the first postmaster general, (September, 1789.) At the same time, he made his appointments for the offices of the judiciary; Congress having created a Supreme Court, with Circuit and District Courts appended. John Jay was the first chief justice of the United States.

Amendments to the Constitution.

Congress had already launched into constitutional discussions. The amendments to the Constitution, proposed by the different states, were numerous enough — fifty and upwards — to call for early attention. It was not suggested either by the states or by their congressional representatives, to make any fundamental alterations in the Constitution. The old federal, now the anti-federalist party, from whom most of the amendments came, asked for no subversion of the national system. They were contented with a few articles, declaring the states and the people in possession of all the powers and all the rights not expressly surrendered to the general government. These articles, to the number of ten, were adopted by Congress, and accepted by the states.

Revenue. A far more vital matter was the revenue. To this Congress addressed itself in the first weeks of the session. The result of long and difficult debates was the enactment of a tariff, intended to serve at once for revenue and for protection of domestic interests. A tonnage duty, with great advantages to American shipping, was also adopted. Some time afterwards, indeed towards the close of the first Congress, an excise was laid on domestic spirits. These measures were modified at intervals. But beneath them, in all their forms, there continued the principle, that the duties upon imports were to provide for government in the shape of a revenue, and for the nation in the shape of protection. It was no time for free trade.

Credit. It fell to the first Congress, likewise, to provide for the public credit. The debts of the Confederation amounted to fifty-four millions of dollars, or to eighty millions if the debts of the states, incurred for general objects, were added. It was the plan of Hamilton, secretary of the treasury, that these debts should be taken as a whole to be assumed and funded by the new government. All sorts of opinions were started. Agreeing that the foreign debt should be treated in the manner proposed, the members of Congress were altogether at variance upon the subject, first, of the domestic debt due from the Confederation itself, and second, of the debt due from the separate states of the Confederation. On the first point, it was argued by a large number, that the certificates of the public debt were no longer in the hands of the original holders, and that to fund them at their par value was simply to put money into the pockets of speculators to whom the first holders had transferred them at great sacrifices. On the second point, that of assuming the state debts, the opposition was still more earnest, especially from the representatives of those states whose exertions during

the war of the revolution had been comparatively limited. It was a matter, moreover, to be supported or opposed according to the various views of the state and the national governments. They who, like the proposer of the system, desired to see the national government strong, advocated its being made the centre of the public credit; while they who inclined to the rights of the states, preferred to have the debt remain in state rather than in national stocks.

Manner of decision.

The question was not decided upon any abstract grounds. It had been a bone of contention where the seat of the general government should be located, some going for one place and some for another. When the House of Representatives decided against assuming the state debts, the advocates of the assumption hit upon the plan of securing the necessary votes from some of the Virginian or Maryland members, by consenting to fix the projected capital on the Potomac.* The bait was snapped at, and a measure on which the honor of the states, if not of the nation, depended, passed by means of unconcealed intrigue. The state debts were then assumed, not in mass, but in certain proportions. This being the chief object of altercation, the funding of the domestic and foreign debt of the general government was rapidly completed, (August 4, 1790.) The transaction was by no means to the satisfaction of the entire nation. Even Virginia, whose representatives had voted for the scheme, considering their state to be amply repaid by the location of the capital on the Potomac, declared against the whole system, save only that part relating to the foreign debt. The funding of the general domestic debt was pronounced to be "dangerous to the rights, and subversive of the interests, of the people;" while that of the state debts was "repugnant to the Constitution." The opposition did not end here.

* Philadelphia to be the capital until 1800.

National bank. The public creditors, on the other hand, were delighted. All the moneyed interests of the country, indeed, were quickened, the public bonds being so much additional capital thrown into the world of industry and of commerce. The creation of a national bank, with the design of sustaining the financial operations of government, took place in the early part of the following year, (1791.) On the opening of the subscription books, a signal proof of the confidence now placed in the national credit was given, the whole number of shares offered being taken up in two hours. At the same time, the number and the earnestness of the party averse to these movements of the government were increased by the success with which they were attended. It had been made a question in the very cabinet of the president, by Jefferson and Randolph, whether the charter of the bank was not beyond the limits of the Constitution. Washington himself had hesitated to approve the act of Congress.

Parties. The construction of the Constitution was one of the points on which parties were now contending. It was a natural principle with the federalists that the Constitution should be interpreted freely; that is, in such a way as to give the government the full measure of its powers. On the other hand, the anti-federalists were for limiting the provisions of the Constitution, if not as far as possible, at least as far as they thought required by the independence of the states and of the people. Every subject brought before Congress excited questions of congressional powers. The organization of the government, the creation of a tariff, of a national debt, and, as just mentioned, of a bank, all were argued for or against, according to the different views of the work to be done by Congress. Party spirit, however, was by no means confined to constitutional arguments. It appeared on every occasion, charging the federalists, now the dominant class, with monarchi-

cal schemes as their ends, and with corrupt dealings as their means; while the anti-federalists, who took the name of republicans, were accused of tendencies to intrigue and to sedition. So violent was the temper on both sides, that the cry went up of separation from the Union. This, too, when the Union was but just formed.

Especially north and south.

But of all the passions so prematurely exploding, none were so threatening as those of the north and the south. The same division that had been observed to be wider than any other before the Constitution, continued wider than any still. Even the controversies between the federalists and the republicans were not so great or so absorbing as to crowd out the matters of dissension between the Southern and the Northern States. Nay, the divisions of the two portions of the country were rather enhanced by those between the two parties; for although there were many republicans in the north and many federalists in the south, yet the south, as a general rule, was republican, and the north federalist. This was inevitable. The interests of the northern industry, its shipping, its commerce, and its manufactures, called for a very different policy on the part of the government from that demanded by the southern agriculture.

Points concerning slavery.

The great line of distinction was run by slavery. The points of this thorny subject, so far from being smoothed by the compromises of the Constitution, stood up as bristling as ever. In the very first year of the new government, there came petitions from the Quakers of Pennsylvania, Delaware, and New Jersey, asking for the abolition of the slave trade. With this, as stated in the account of the Convention, Congress had no power to interfere for a period of twenty years. But the introduction of the subject brought up a storm, as it was called by a member from Georgia, which lasted for days and even

weeks, until the adoption of a committee's report that Congress had no authority over the slave trade, except with foreign countries, until 1808, the date prescribed by the Constitution. At the same time, all pretensions to control the treatment or the emancipation of slaves, in the states where they existed, were expressly abjured by Congress. This did not prevent an earnest Delaware Quaker from petitioning some two or three years afterwards for the abolition of slavery. The petition was returned to the petitioner, (November, 1792.) A later memorial, (January, 1794,) from a convention of societies for the abolition of slavery, held at Philadelphia, asking Congress to take such measures as the Constitution allowed against the slave trade, resulted in an act prohibiting the trade with foreign lands. So far as related to the slave trade, there seems to have been no opposition on the part of the Southern States to its suppression. They were all moving more or less actively in the same direction.* What they opposed was the interference of Congress with slavery within the limits of the country.

As to the territories.

On this particular point the opposing theories of after years were not yet distinctly formed. But there was an evident foreboding of future divisions. It was generally agreed that Congress had no power in relation to slavery in the states. But it was generally urged on one side, and by no means generally repelled on the other, that the existence of slavery, as of any other system, in the territories, did depend upon Congress. There were the clauses of the Constitution — "The Congress shall have power to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting, the territory or other property

* The traffic was prohibited in all the states by 1798. South Carolina, however, revived it in 1804.

belonging to the United States;" "New states may be admitted by the Congress into this Union." On these the opponents of slavery relied, as empowering Congress to exclude the system from any territories to be organized, or any states to be admitted. The great precedent of the Northwest Territory, where slavery was expressly prohibited by the Congress of the Confederation, was ratified by the first Congress under the Constitution. It claimed — so the northern men felt — to be not only ratified, but followed. That it might be followed, was distinctly amongst the apprehensions of the southerners, the more naturally from its having been proposed by one of themselves, Thomas Jefferson, as we have read, to exclude slavery from all the unsettled territories. When North Carolina ceded her western lands to the Union, she did so on the express condition "that no regulation made or to be made by Congress shall tend to the emancipation of slaves," (1789.)

Starting point of future strife.

Here was the starting point of all future strife. It was in the power of Congress to reject the proposed condition on the ground that its authority over the territories was not thus to be trammelled. Or it might have taken exactly the opposite ground, and declared that it had no right to impose any conditions upon the territories. Supposing either position to have been taken permanently, the question of slavery in the territories might have come up again. But the constitutional principle on which it could be decided as often as it recurred, would have been established. Of all this there seems to have been little or no perception. Not even Washington — he who was so fixed against all sectional divisions — exerted himself to close this prolific source of bitterness and of contention. Congress accepted the cession of North Carolina, and organized the district as the Territory South of the Ohio, (1790.)

Presidential tours.

Meanwhile the unity of the country, despite its parties and its broils, had been happily illustrated in the tours of the president. He first visited the New England States, Rhode Island excepted,* (October, November, 1789;) then Rhode Island, (August, 1790;) and, lastly, the Central and Southern States, (April–June, 1791.) No earthly potentate had ever received such homage as the republican magistrate, the revolutionary chief, the Christian man, all blended in Washington. It was a homage offered principally to the individual, but the light which shone about him was diffused over the nation of which he was the head and the representative.

Work of the states.

The states had not been idle. They were learning their new relations to the general government, and, through this, to one another. Within their own borders, much was to be done to set up the law that had been shaken and the order that had been disturbed for the ten, twenty, or even thirty years before. Many of the late Constitutions were remodelled, and some new ones were framed.

New states.

New states were presenting themselves for admission into the line of the thirteen. The consent of New York having been obtained, Vermont was admitted, (March 4, 1791.) Provision was already made for the entrance of Kentucky in the following year, (June 1, 1792.) The Territory South of the Ohio was subsequently admitted as the State of Tennessee, (June 1, 1796.)

Dependence upon Washington.

But the interest of the period was concentrated on the general government. By this, it was felt, and not by any local authorities or any local movements, the difficulties of the nation were to be met and overcome. The general government itself was concen-

* Not then a member of the Union.

trated in Washington. They who deny him power of character, acknowledging his excellence and his judiciousness, without acknowledging his inspiration of thought and his energy of action, may turn to the group gathered at Philadelphia, the capital, and see the eyes of their heroes, federalist or republican, northerner or southerner, all fixed on Washington for protection, especially as the four years of his presidency drew to a close. Jefferson, the head of the republicans, wrote to him, "The confidence of the whole Union is centred in you. Your being at the helm will be more than an answer to every argument which can be used to alarm and lead the people in any quarter into violence or secession. North and south will hang together, if they have you to hang on." "It is clear," wrote Hamilton, the leader of the federalists, "that a general and strenuous effort is making in every state to place the administration of the national government in the hands of its enemies, as if they were its safest guardians; that the period of the next House of Representatives is likely to prove the crisis of its permanent character; that, if you continue in office, nothing materially mischievous is to be apprehended — if you quit, much is to be dreaded." Randolph, the attorney general, — a sort of leader to a middle party, neither wholly federalist nor wholly republican, — was equally pressing. "The fuel," he wrote to Washington, "which has been already gathered for combustion, wants no addition. But how awfully might it be increased, were the violence which is now suspended by a universal submission to your pretensions let loose by your resignation!" Thus urged, Washington could do no less than accept the unanimous summons to another term of labor for his country. Adams was again chosen vice president, (1792–93.)

There was one thing over which Washington had no influence. The animosity of parties had spared him, but

Animosity of parties.

without being checked by him. He vainly exerted himself to keep the peace, even in his own cabinet. Jefferson and Hamilton were at swords' points, and at swords' points they remained until Jefferson retired, (1794.) In Congress, all was uproar. The slightest question sufficed to set the northerner against the southerner, the federalist against the republican. Out of Congress, the tumult was increasing. Influences to which we must revert had swelled the dissensions of the nation with "very different views," as Washington wrote, "some bad, and, if I might be allowed to use so harsh an expression, diabolical." A new party, chiefly from the republican ranks, had gathered, under the name of democrats, in societies of which the model was taken from abroad, and which, as Washington wrote, might "shake the government to its foundation."

Insurrection in Pennsylvania.

The fearful passion of the time at length broke out in insurrection. In consequence of the excise upon domestic spirits, some parts of the country where distillation was common had been greatly discontented. North Carolina and Pennsylvania, or rather the interior counties of those states, had been agitated to such a degree, that the president deemed it necessary to issue a proclamation, calling upon his fellow-citizens to support the laws, (1792.) The excitement gradually subsided, except in Pennsylvania, where, after various acts of violence, an armed convention, seven thousand strong, met at Braddock's Field, (August, 1794.) The president of this assembly was a Colonel Cook, the secretary, Albert Gallatin, a Swiss emigrant; and the commander of the troops a lawyer named Bradford. Of course, the objects of so large a body were various; some being intent merely upon suspending the collection of the excise, while others meditated the possession of the country, and separation from the Union. The president at once put forth a procla-

mation, "warning the insurgents to desist from their opposition to the laws." Commissioners were at the same time appointed to proceed to the scene of disturbance, and persuade the actors to return to their duty. It being found, however, that nothing but force, or the show of force, would put down the insurrection, another proclamation was published, announcing the march of fifteen thousand militia from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, and Virginia. The president himself took the field for a few days; but finding that the insurgents had disappeared before the approach of his troops, he left his officers — General Henry Lee, governor of Virginia, being commander-in-chief — to complete the work that was no sooner begun than it was ended. A considerable number of prisoners was taken; but no executions followed, (November.) Enough had been done to decide "the contest," as Washington described it, "whether a small proportion of the United States shall dictate to the whole Union."

Indian wars.

The same year (1794) witnessed the suppression of a danger, half domestic and half foreign — a long-continued Indian war. It broke out, four years before, on the attempt of various western tribes to recover the country as far as the Ohio. A thousand men, partly United States troops, and partly militia from Pennsylvania and Kentucky, were sent into the heart of the hostile region. Two detachments, under Colonel Hardin, fell into ambuscades; while the main body, under General Harmer, marched, countermarched, and at length retreated, (1790.) The next year, after several incursions of volunteers into the Indian territory, an army of some two thousand, under General St. Clair, started, late in the autumn, to reduce the enemy. Delayed by the construction of forts, the troops were advancing but slowly, when they were surprised in camp, and utterly routed by the Indians, (1791.) Two

years passed in fruitless attempts at negotiation. An army of three or four thousand, slowly enlisted under the command of General Wayne, the hero of Stony Point, at length proceeded to more decisive measures. Spending the winter and the spring in camp, Wayne took the field in the following summer. Securing his rear by forts along the route which he pursued, he overtook and completely vanquished the Indians, driving them from their posts, and laying waste their fields, (1794.) A treaty made with Wayne a year afterwards (1795) renounced the claims which had led the unhappy Indians into war. There still remained upon the south-western borders the restless tribes that had taken up arms from time to time during the war with their brethren of the north-west. Peace with them was made a year later, (1796.) In both treaties, the United States took an attitude never before assumed by the whites, as a nation, towards the red man. The truth that the Indians were not the aggressors so much as the borderers, nay, the United States themselves, seems to have been tacitly recognized by the indemnities to the conquered or the pacified tribes.

Indian interests.

It was equally new in the history of the Indian race, that the white men should unite nationally in supplying their wants and improving their relations. No part of Washington's administration, domestic or foreign, was more original or more benign than the policy which he constantly urged towards the Indians of the United States. To save them from the frauds of traders, a national system of trade was adopted. To protect them from the aggressions of borderers, as well as to secure them in the rights allowed them by their treaties, a number of laws were prepared. "I add with pleasure," said the president in one of his later addresses to Congress, "that the probability of their civilization is not diminished by the experiments which

have been thus far made under the auspices of government. The accomplishment of this work, if practicable, will reflect undecaying lustre on our national character, and administer the most grateful consolation that virtuous minds can know," (December, 1795.)

Heckewelder, the missionary.

Among the agents employed by the administration in dealing with the Indians was a remarkable man. John Heckewelder, born in England, of German parentage, came to Pennsylvania in his youth, and there in his early manhood became a missionary of the United Brethren, or Moravians, amongst the Delawares and the Mohegans, (1771.) His life thenceforward was devoted to the Indians. He preached to them, that they might be converted to God. He wrote of them, that they might be respected of men. "I still indulge the hope," he wrote in his old age, "that this work [for the Indians] will be accomplished by a wise and benevolent government."

Tribute to Algiers.

A far more savage foe than the Indian was appeased at the same period, but with much less credit, it must be added, to the nation. This was the Dey of Algiers, who, with a number of neighbors like himself, was wont to sweep the seas with piratical craft. Singular to say, the sway of these buccaneering potentates was acknowledged by the European states, who paid an annual tribute on condition of their commerce being spared. Ten years before the present date, the freebooters of the Dey of Algiers had captured two American vessels, and thrown their crews into bondage. He now (1795) consented to release his captives, and to respect the merchantmen of the United States, on the reception of a tribute like that received from the powers of Europe. Three quarters of a million were paid down; an annual payment of full fifty thousand dollars being promised in addition. Other

treaties of the same sort with Tripoli and Tunis were under way.

Foreign relations.

The relations of the United States with civilized nations were hardly more satisfactory. The monarchies of Europe looked down, if they looked at all, upon the infant republic, of which many of them really knew almost nothing. What was of vast moment to a people rising out of depression and of obscurity, was a trifle in the eyes of old states, accustomed to deal with great interests and with great resources. Their relations with America were matters of little concern to them. On the other hand, the relations of America to them, or to some of them, formed the chief point of attention and of exertion with the American nation for a quarter of a century.

Commercial treaties.

We must go back to days over which we have passed, in order to see how the United States presented themselves to the older nations. "Our fathers," said John Quincy Adams, himself a foreign minister under Washington, "extended the hand of friendship to every nation on the globe." Their first treaty, the one with France, in which the affairs of commerce and of peace were mingled with those of alliance and of war, was followed by one with Prussia, (1785.) "This," remarked Adams, "consecrated three fundamental principles of foreign intercourse. First, equal reciprocity and the mutual stipulation of the commercial exchanges of peace; secondly, the abolition of private war on the ocean; and thirdly, restrictions favorable to neutral commerce upon belligerent parties with regard to contraband of war and blockades. These principles were assumed as cardinal points of the policy of the Union." It was a policy, however, in perpetual collision with the usages and prerogatives of the European powers; so much so, that, though the young nation held out an open hand, it was met by contracted

grasps. The state of things will appear as we go on to the negotiations of Washington's administration.

Treaty with Spain.

One of the first to come into more settled relations with the new government was Spain. That power, through its colonial authorities in Florida, had been supposed to be tampering with the southern Indians. On the other hand, it was notorious that several expeditions from the southern and western frontiers were planned against the Spanish territory. All the while, the dividing line between Florida and the United States was unsettled, and the claim to the navigation of the Mississippi undetermined. Finally, a special envoy, Thomas Pinckney, was sent to Spain. It took him nearly a year to bring about a treaty defining the Florida boundary, and opening the Mississippi to the United States, (1795.) Even then the Spaniards delayed to fulfil provisions in which they took but small interest.

Relations with Great Britain and France.

The relations with Spain were bad enough. But those with Great Britain and France were worse. We must speak of these nations together, since it was their common, rather than their separate, influences which operated to the extent that is to be described. Side by side, in the first place, were the feelings of amity to France and of animosity to Britain; the seeds were planted in war, and their growth was not checked in peace. Britain continued to wear the aspect of an antagonist, keeping her troops upon the United States territory until her demands were satisfied, while on the other side of the sea she laid one restraint after another upon commerce, as if she would have kept the Americans at a distance from her shores. France, on the contrary, was still the friend of the rising nation, and not only as its patron, but as its follower. The same year that Washington entered the presidency, the French revolution began.

Its early movements, professedly inspired by those that had taken place in America, kindled all the sympathies of American hearts. Hitherto, the bond between them and the French was one of gratitude and of dependence; now it was one of sympathy and of equality.

Parties thereupon.

But we are not to imagine our fathers to have harmonized upon these points any more than upon the others that have been noticed. The nation was by no means unanimous against Great Britain, by no means unanimous for France. Deep, indeed, but still in action, were the sentiments of former times when France was the foe, and Britain the mother-land. To these a new impulse was given by the early excesses of the revolution. With their ideas of law and order, the Americans could not go along with the French, rioters from the first, and soon destroyers and murderers, rather than freemen. Many paused, and turning with distrust from the scenes of which France was the unhappy theatre, looked with kinder emotions towards the sedater and the wiser Britain. It would be too much to say that this led to a British party; but it did lead to a neutral one, while, on the other hand, a French party, applauding the license as well as the liberty of the revolution, clapped their hands the more enthusiastically as the spectacle became wilder and bloodier. This party was the republican; its more impetuous members being the democratic republicans. Their opponents were the federalists. The new dissensions came just in time to keep up the division between the two. Mere federalist and republican questions might have waned; they were already less glowing than they had been. They were revived by the strife of the French with the anti-French party.

Few had spoken of doing more than looking on at the events in Europe. Yet there were some so excited, so maddened, as to be ready for any extremities, especially

Washington proclaims neutrality.

when the France whom they worshipped declared war against the Britain whom they abhorred. More divided than ever, the nation was again close upon the breakers, when Washington — never greater, never wiser — issued his proclamation of neutrality, making it known "that the duty and interest of the United States require that they should with sincerity and good faith adopt and pursue a conduct friendly and impartial towards the belligerent powers," (April 22, 1793.) It is a memorable act in our history.

Point proposed.

Its purpose is not always rightly estimated. Look at the nation tasked to its utmost, one may almost say, to subdue a few Indian tribes, obliged to pay tribute to the Algerines, unable to keep the Spaniards to their obligations, and we shall not behold a power that could enter safely into European wars. If such a thing were attempted, it would be at the hazard of the independence that had been achieved. There were two risks; one arising from the certainty that the United States must be a subordinate ally in any war to which it became a party; and the other, — a still graver one, — that the passions aroused by a foreign would find no vent but in a civil war. It was, as he said, "to keep the United States free," that Washington proclaimed neutrality.

Mission of Genet.

The system was soon put to trial. France, having baptized herself a republic in the blood of her king, Louis XVI., sent a new minister to the United States in the person of citizen Genet. An enthusiastic representative of his nation, Genet excited a fresh enthusiasm in the French party of America. Feasted at Charleston, where he landed, (April, 1793,) and at all the principal places on the route northward, he was led to imagine the entire country at his feet, or at those of the French republic. He began at Charleston to send out privateers, and to

order that their prizes should be tried and condemned by the French consuls in the United States. It was a part of the treaty of commerce between the two nations, that the privateers and prizes of the French should be admitted to the American ports. But Genet was soon to be checked. He had not merely a divided people to deal with, but a government; and although the government itself had its divisions, it was so far accordant as to oppose the ambassador, to whom, on his arrival at Philadelphia, it stood ready to declare that whatever the treaty provided for, it did not provide for the commission of privateers or the condemnation of prizes within American limits. This is not the place to describe the proceedings of so wild a personage as Genet. He did battle for his privateers and his courts; appealed from the executive to Congress and the people; and pursued so extreme a course as to set his supporters and his opponents bitterly at variance. The French party now went openly for war against England. "Marat, Robespierre, Brissot, and the Mountain," says Vice President Adams, "were the constant themes of panegyric and the daily toasts at table. . . . Washington's house was surrounded by an innumerable multitude from day to day, huzzaing, demanding war against England, cursing Washington, and crying, 'Success to the French patriots and virtuous republicans.' Frederic A. Muhlenberg, the speaker of the House of Representatives, toasted publicly, 'The Mountain: may it be a pyramid that shall reach the skies.'" "I had rather be in my grave," exclaimed Washington one day in great excitement, "than in my present situation." He was equal, however, and more than equal, to his duty and, supported by his cabinet, he sent to request the recall of Genet, (August.) As the party by which Genet had been commissioned had sunk to ruin, their successors readily appointed a minister of their own — citizen Fauchet.

Great Britain and France invade American neutrality.

But the troubles of the time were too complicated to be reached by a mere change of ministers. France had pronounced against the neutrality of America, — not, indeed, by direct menace or violence, but by ordering that neutral vessels, containing goods belonging to her enemies, should be captured, (May 1, 1793.) An embargo was then laid upon the shipping at Bordeaux. Both these measures were decided violations of the treaty with America. The most that France did, however, was as nothing compared with the extremes to which her chief enemy, Great Britain, resorted. France had ordered that the goods of an enemy were liable to capture. Great Britain now ordered that the goods of a neutral power, if consisting of provisions for the enemy, were to be captured or bought up, unless shipped to a friendly port, (June.) This was followed by an order that all vessels laden with the produce of a French colony, or with supplies for the same, were lawful prizes, (November;) a decree so arbitrary that it was soon modified by the nation that issued it, (January, 1794.) Worse than all, Great Britain claimed the right to impress into her service every seaman of British birth, wherever he might be found; so that the ships of the United States would be stopped, searched, and stripped of their crews, at the pleasure of the British cruisers. It often happened that American sailors, as well as British, were the victims of this impressment. A thrill of indignation and of defiance against such proceedings ran through the Americans. They would have been less than freemen, less, even, than men, to have borne with such injuries in silence.

Threatened war with Great Britain.

The course of Great Britain is easily explained. Its rulers regarded the United States merely as a commercial people who were contributing to the

resources of the enemy. Did they look upon the nation in any political light, they felt sure — thus Washington was informed from London — "that there was a party so decidedly in the British sentiment that bearing and forbearing would be carried to any length." But they were mistaken. The very party most opposed to France were earnest in sustaining the necessity of preparations for war, defensive, indeed, but still war with Great Britain. A temporary embargo upon the American ports was voted by Congress, for the purpose of suspending commercial intercourse, (March, 1794.) The House of Representatives passed an act prohibiting all trade with Great Britain and her colonies, until she redressed the wrongs which she had perpetrated; the act would have passed the Senate likewise, but for the casting vote of the vice president, (April.) The partisans of the French were all alive for further action; their opponents were hardly prepared to resist it. One step on the part of the executive, one hint that Washington, the still trusted though still slandered magistrate, was in favor of arming, and the nation would have armed. With Great Britain, in all her might, for a foe, and with France, in all her blood-red despotism, for an ally, what would have been the war!

Mission of Jay.

One of Washington's secretaries, Jefferson, had lately resigned his post, leaving his personal as well as political opponent, Hamilton, the head of the cabinet. To him, as the most eminent member of the administration, the president would have confided the special mission which it was proposed to send to Great Britain. But Hamilton, as an extreme federalist, was too unacceptable to the great body of Congress and of the nation to be employed upon a service which of itself was an object of general distrust and aversion. Washington therefore selected Chief Justice Jay, (April, 1794.) It was a fitting choice, far more so than

that of Hamilton. The secretary would have been the representative, not of the nation alone, but of the party which acknowledged him as its leader; he was always a party man, whether in office or out of office. But the chief justice, though a federalist, was no partisan. Amongst all the prominent figures of the time, Jay's is almost, perhaps altogether, the only one that stands close to Washington's, aloof from the tarnishes and the collisions of opposing parties. No other man was so fit to join with Washington in rescuing the nation from its present perils.

His treaty. Accordingly, Jay proceeded to England, and, after some months of anxious diplomacy, obtained a treaty, (November.) It was not much to obtain. The United States agreeing to indemnify their British creditors, Great Britain consented to surrender the posts which she had so long held in the west.* She also promised indemnity to the sufferers from her system of search and of capture; yet the system itself, though partially modified, was by no means renounced. A few concessions to the claims of American commerce were also made; but the rigid policy of Britain, especially in relation to her colonial trade, was strongly maintained. In short, the treaty did not acknowledge the rights of the Americans as neutrals, or their privileges as traders; both matters of the highest importance to their commercial interests. At the same time, the earlier points of controversy were determined, and from the later ones the sting was taken away, at least in some degree. So Jay thought, so Washington, though neither considered the treaty decidedly satisfactory. It was better, at any rate, they reasoned, than war. Thus, too, reasoned the Senate, who, convened in special session, advised the ratification of the treaty, (June, 1795.)

* The surrender to take effect June 1, 1796.

Opposition. Not thus, however, the nation. If the necessity of the treaty, even as it stood, needed to be proved, the proof was the general insanity which it provoked. Meetings were held every where; harangues were made, resolutions passed; copies of the treaty were destroyed; Jay was burned in effigy. The French and the American flags waved together over these scenes; while the British ensign was dragged through the dirt and burned before the doors of the British representatives.

Ratification. All this, and more, if intended to intimidate government, had a precisely contrary effect. "I have never," wrote Washington, "since I have been in the administration of the government, seen a crisis which is pregnant with more interesting events, nor one from which more is to be apprehended." "Did the treaty with Great Britain," he asked afterwards, "surrender any right of which the United States had been in possession? Did it make any change or alteration in the law of nations, under which Great Britain had acted in defiance of all the powers of Europe? If none of these, why all this farrago?" The French party were of course the active leaders in all disturbances. Their antagonists, certainly not a British party now, kept themselves in the background at first, but presently rallied, not as a British, or even as an anti-French, so much as an American party, to the support of the president, assuring him and his government of the unabated confidence of the nation. At the same time, Jefferson's successor, Randolph, being suspected of intrigue with the French minister, resigned his office, and in the reaction thus excited against the influence and the partisanship of France, the cabinet advised the ratification of the British treaty. It was done, (August.)

Continued opposition. Opposition continued. The Virginian legislature, approving the stand of their senators against

the treaty, refused to pass a vote of undiminished confidence in the president. If Virginia could thus turn away from the son to whom she had hitherto clung with all a mother's pride, the tone in other states may be conceived to have been even more expressive of disapprobation. But Virginia was strongly republican and strongly French, consequently strongly anti-British. So far did the legislature go in its wrath, as to propose an amendment of the Constitution, to the effect of requiring the assent of the House of Representatives before a treaty could be ratified, (November.) The example of Virginia was imitated even in Congress, where the phrase of "undiminished confidence" was stricken from an address of the house to the president, (December.) As the session progressed, a fierce struggle arose with respect to the bills for carrying out the British treaty. The opponents of the treaty made it their first effort to obtain the papers relating to the transaction, on the plea that it lay with the House to consent or to refuse to execute the provisions of the treaty. A three weeks' debate terminated in a call upon the president for the specified documents. He and his cabinet being alike of opinion that the House had transgressed its powers, the call was refused. The House took the denial with a better grace than might have been anticipated; the leaders of the opposition now throwing their whole weight upon the point of defeating the bills on which the execution of the treaty depended. Nor was it until after a fortnight's debate, in which Fisher Ames distinguished himself above all his colleagues in defending the treaty, that a vote, by a bare majority, determined that the House would proceed to its duty, (March, April, 1796.) By this time the frenzy out of doors had died away.

The point gained.

Thus terminated the great event of Washington's administration. Its course, so far as he was con-

cerned, followed precisely the principles with which he had entered office. In face of the parties that divided the country, in face of their feelings and their relations to Great Britain and France, Washington saw but one alternative — peace or war. And not peace or war with the stranger alone, but between citizen and citizen. Enough has been already said on the interests and the dangers involved in the decision. The proclamation of neutrality was the first decisive step, the treaty with Great Britain was the second, and, for the present, the last. The point thus gained may be called the starting point of the infant nation in its foreign relations. But hear Washington himself: "My ardent desire is, and my aim has been, to keep the United States free from political connections with every other country, to see them independent of all and under the influence of none. In a word, I want an American character, that the powers of Europe may be convinced we act for ourselves, and not for others. This, in my judgment, is the only way to be respected abroad and happy at home; and not, by becoming the partisans of Great Britain or France, create dissensions, disturb the public tranquillity, and destroy, perhaps forever, the cement which binds the Union."

Continued embarrassments: from abroad.

Things were far, however, from going smoothly. What Washington wrote a few months before was still true: "This government, in relation to France and England, may be compared to a ship between the rocks of Scylla and Charybdis." The treaty being ratified, Charybdis was avoided. But Scylla rose the more frowningly. If the French party of the United States, if the minister of the United States to France, James Monroe, were indignant at the British treaty, it was but natural that France should be the same. The French government announced to Mr. Monroe that they considered their alliance with the United States to be at an end, (February,

1796.) The chief reason was the treaty with Great Britain; but the list of grievances, then and afterwards filled out, comprehended all the measures by which American neutrality had been sustained. To prove that they were in earnest, the authorities of France, in addition to their previous orders of capture and embargo, decreed that neutral vessels were to be treated exactly as they were treated by the British; that is, stopped, searched, and seized upon the seas, (July.) This was subsequently made known to the United States by a communication from the French envoy, Adet, (October,) who improved the opportunity by appealing to the people to take part with France and against Great Britain, (November.) To restore matters, as far as possible, to a better position, Washington had sent out Charles C. Pinckney as minister to France, in the place of Monroe, (September.) But the clouds that had been dissipated on the side of Great Britain were more than replaced by the ominous signs in the direction of France.

And at home. It was still worse at home. The parties — northern and southern, federalist and republican, anti-French and French — that racked the nation were never so much agitated. "Until within the last year or two," wrote Washington, "I had no idea that parties would, or even could, go to the length I have been witness to." Congress was a continual battle ground. The federal party, falling into the minority in the House, and in danger of losing their majority in the Senate, fought, it may be literally said, on one side; their opponents, the republicans, animated with the hope of the superiority, being equally pugnacious on the other. Newspapers, especially those published at Philadelphia, carried the hostile notes from Congress to the nation, and echoed them back to Congress. It is difficult, without having room for extracts, to convey

any idea of the virulence of political writing at the time. Statesmanship disappears in partisanship, the love of country in the hatred of countrymen. All this, while it demonstrated the wisdom of the administration or of its head, rendered the course of the administration doubtful and imperilled. In fact, both the administration and its head were objects of the fiercest assault.

Abuse of Washington.

Washington wrote with natural indignation of the abuse which he, "no party man," as he truly called himself, had received, "and that, too, in such exaggerated and indecent terms as could scarcely be applied to a Nero, a notorious defaulter, or even to a common pickpocket." It was amidst these outrages that Washington sent forth his Farewell Address to the people of the United States, (September 17, 1796.) Soon afterwards, Congress came together, and showed that many of its members were violent against the retiring president. On the proposal of an address of grateful acknowledgments from the House of Representatives, a man from Washington's own state, William B. Giles, of Virginia, took exception to the more expressive passages, saying, "If I stand alone in the opinion, I will declare that I am not convinced that the administration of the government for these six years has been wise and firm. I do not regret the president's retiring from office." Giles was not alone. The same attitude was taken by a considerable number, and amongst them Andrew Jackson, of Tennessee, (December.) "Although he is soon to become a private citizen," wrote Washington of himself, (January, 1797,) "his opinions are to be knocked down, and his character reduced as low as they are capable of sinking it." Two months later, in the last hours of his administration, he said, "To the wearied traveller, who sees a resting place, and is bending his body to lean thereon, I now compare myself; but to be suffered to do this in peace,

is too much to be endured by some." If Washington could thus excite animosity and wrong, what must it have been with ordinary men? The country seemed unwilling to be pacified, unwilling to be saved.

Retirement of Washington.

Washington retired. He had done even greater things at the head of the government than he had done at the head of the army. But it was beyond his power to change the character of the nation. He left it as he found it — divided and impassioned. Yet he left it as he had not found it — with a Constitution in operation, with principles and with laws in action — on the road to increase and to maturity. "I can never believe," were almost his last words as president, "that Providence, which has guided us so long, and through such a labyrinth, will withdraw its protection at this crisis." The day after writing this, he saw his successor, John Adams, inaugurated, (March 4, 1797.)

Lafayette.

One who had hailed the administration at its beginning was not amongst those to behold its close. Lafayette was a prisoner at Olmütz, under the power of Austria. But he was not forgotten. It is refreshing amidst the angry chaos of foreign controversies and of domestic struggles, to encounter Washington, not as the president, but as the American, writing his "private letter," as he termed it, to the Emperor of Germany, "to recommend Lafayette to the mediation of humanity," and "to entreat that he may be permitted to come to this country," (May, 1796.) The effect of the appeal is not known; but Lafayette was liberated not long afterwards.

PART IV.

THE GROWING NATION.

1797–1850.

CHAPTER I.

Foreign Aggressions.

Party administrations.

The contrast between the administration of Washington and the administrations of his successors is as wide as that between a nation and a party. He was the head of the nation; they have been the heads of parties, as well as of the nation. First comes John Adams, the federalist, (1797;) then Thomas Jefferson, the republican, (1801;) then James Madison, likewise the republican, (1809.) Not one of these chief magistrates, it is true, was a mere partisan. Adams, the early champion of independence, was faithful to his principles of nationality; but he found himself dependent, not on the nation, but on a party, for support, and shaped his administration, as of necessity, by party lines. Not confining himself so strictly to these as the more ardent federalists demanded, they turned against him, and as the nation would not rally to his defence, he lost his reëlection. Jefferson, vice president under Adams, was much more of a party leader. He had generous theories, indeed, but his practices did not always conform to them; and though he began his administration by declaring that "we are all republicans, all federalists," he never proved himself a federalist, nor did the federalists become republicans. Madison was a much less enthusiastic politician than his predecessors. He bowed to the signs of the times, and became not so much a party leader as a party follower. The point with all the three

was, that they were chiefs of but a part of the nation, not of the whole.

Parties amongst the people.

In this they were in harmony with those over whom they were called to rule. The people were divided into parties. So they had been under Washington; but while he conducted affairs, there was at least one in power to whom patriotic men could look up without party feelings. With his successors, the case was different; and though there might be a number in one place, or a number in another, whose sympathies were with the nation, rather than with any party, there was no one to be their representative or their example. The large majority, more deeply interested in political affairs than most men of the present day, broke up into divisions, full of earnestness for their own doctrines, full of wrath against all besides.

Parties in relation to foreign aggressions.

The natural consequences followed. Even in relation to the foreign aggressions — which we shall soon be tracing — parties will be found to have existed in all their force. If one nation dealt a blow against the country, it was sure to be excused by one party; if another did the same, there was another party to explain away the wrong. On the other hand, there were always some to censure every act of one power, and others to denounce every measure of another power. So strong did these feelings become, that the subjects which called them forth took precedence of all others in the controversies of the time. Perhaps it was natural for the young nation to be more excited by the vast interests of its elders, than by its own comparatively petty concerns. At any rate, it was what foreign powers were doing, rather than what the United States had to do, which formed the staple of political action for the fifteen years (1797–1812) following the retirement of Washington.

Missions to France. Chief amongst the combatants in Europe, and the aggressors against America, were Great Britain and France. For the moment, the relations with France occupied the foreground. Charles C. Pinckney, accredited by Washington to negotiate with the French government, was refused an audience at Paris; and not only that, but was ordered to depart the French territory, (December, 1796—February, 1797.) Notwithstanding this, notwithstanding the rapidly following decrees against American ships and American crews, President Adams sent out a new mission, consisting of Pinckney, John Marshall, and Elbridge Gerry, with moderate instructions, which, however, availed nothing. Pinckney and Marshall, incensed by the intrigue as well as the insolence of which they were the objects, (October, 1797—April, 1798,) shook off the dust of France from their feet, being followed in a few months by Gerry, who had undertaken to do alone what he had not been able to do with his colleagues.

Arming of the United States. Before the withdrawal of Pinckney and Marshall, the intelligence of their treatment had thrown the United States into a great excitement. The republicans taunted their opponents with the failure which they said they had predicted for the French missions. All the more bitter were the federalists, who inveighed against the venality of the French government, some even going so far as to call for a declaration of war. The president leaned to the side of his party. He had no mind to declare war, but he recommended Congress to put the country in a state of defence, (March, 1798.) The recommendation was at once opposed by the republican leaders. According to Vice President Jefferson, indeed, the president was aiming at a dissolution of the Union or at the establishment of a monarchical government. But the federalists upheld the president, and carried a series of measures pro-

viding for the organization of a provisional army, as well as of a naval department, by which the existing navy might be more efficiently managed, (May.) Orders were issued, directing the national ships to seize all armed vessels engaged in hostile acts against American shipping; while merchantmen were authorized to arm themselves, and capture their assailants upon the seas. But to prevent hostilities, as far as possible, commercial intercourse with France and her colonies was formally prohibited, (June.) Soon after, Washington was appointed to the command of the provisional army, (July.) The United States were fairly in arms.

War. War followed at sea. No declaration was made; the most that was done being to proclaim the treaties with France void, and then to authorize the president to send out national and to commission private vessels for the purpose of capturing any armed ships of the French, whether participating or not in hostilities, (July.) The seas were at once overrun with American ships, by which the French privateers were taken or driven from the coast. No actual engagement between national vessels, however, occurred, until the beginning of the following year, when Commander Truxtun, in the Constellation, forced the French frigate L'Insurgente to strike, (February, 1799.) Hostilities were continued chiefly by privateers, the profits to whose owners were the principal results of the war. Still it pleased the party by whom it was favored. "A glorious and triumphant war it was!" exclaimed Adams, in after years. "The proud pavilion of France was humiliated."

Strain upon the nation. But against the deeds of battle must be set the measures of government. These alone show the strain upon the nation. To provide ways and means, stamp duties and taxes on houses and slaves were voted, besides the loans that were procured. To keep down party

opposition, alien and sedition acts, as they were called, were passed. The first authorized the president to banish all aliens suspected of conspiracy against the United States. This was more of a party manœuvre than appears on the face of it; inasmuch as many of the most ardent spirits of the republicans, especially the democratic republicans, were aliens. The sedition act denounced fine and imprisonment upon all conspiracies, and even all publications, "with intent to excite any unlawful combination for opposing or resisting any law of the United States, or any lawful act of the president." Both these acts, however, were to be but temporary.* It was at midsummer that party spirit rose so high as to demand and to enact these urgent laws, (June — July, 1798.) The alien act was never put in operation. But the sedition act was again and again enforced, and almost, if not altogether invariably, upon party grounds. It may safely be said that the nation was straining itself too far.

Nullification. So thought the party opposing the administration and the war. Strongest in the south and in the west, the republican leaders threw down the gauntlet to their opponents, nay, even to their rulers. The legislature of Kentucky, in resolutions drawn up for that body by no less a person than Vice President Jefferson, declared the alien and sedition laws "not law, but altogether void and of no force," (November, 1798.) The note thus sounded was taken up in the Virginia legislature, whose resolutions, draughted by James Madison, declared the obnoxious laws "palpable and alarming infractions of the Constitution," (December.) Both sets of resolutions, as they came from the hands of their framers, were stronger still. Jefferson

* The alien to be in force for two years, the sedition until March 4, 1801, the end of Adams's administration.

had written, "Where powers are assumed which have not been delegated, a nullification of the act is the right remedy, and every state has a natural right, in cases not within the compact, [the Constitution,] to nullify of their own authority all assumptions of power by others within their limits." Madison, after stating "that in case of a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of other powers not granted by the compact, the states, who are the parties thereto, have the right, and are in duty bound, to interpose for correcting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining within their respective limits the authorities, rights, and liberties appertaining to them," had made his resolutions declare the acts in question "null, void, and of no force or effect." But it was an early day for nullification; and neither Kentucky nor Virginia went the length prescribed for them. They went far enough, as has been seen, to excite very general opposition from their sister states, especially those of the centre and the north, where legislature after legislature came out with strong and denunciatory denials of the right of any state to sit in judgment upon the national government.

Another mission to France.

Things were in this seething state, the factions on both sides being at the height of their passions, when the president nominated a minister to France in the person of William Van Murray, to whom he afterwards joined Oliver Ellsworth, then chief justice, and William R. Davie, as colleagues, (February, 1799.) The reason assigned for a fresh attempt at negotiation was the assurance that had been received through Van Murray, then minister at the Hague, of the willingness of the French government to treat with a new mission. The instructions subsequently drawn up for the three envoys directed them to pursue a more decided course than had been enjoined upon their predecessors; they were to insist upon redress

for the decrees and the captures of the French; yet, unless received on their arrival at Paris, they were not to linger, but to demand their passports and abandon the mission. In all this, one finds it difficult to detect any thing unworthy of the nation. But the din upon the nomination of the embassy was tremendous. All the more active federalists, conspicuous amongst whom were the principal members of the cabinet, Timothy Pickering and Oliver Wolcott, cried out against the treachery of the president. It was treachery against their party rather than against their country, even in their own eyes; but they were blinded by the political animosity that dazzled and bewildered almost all around them. The president himself was suspected of urging the mission, in some degree, out of spite against the federal party, by whom, or by whose extreme members, he considered himself badly used. "The British faction," he wrote afterwards, "was determined to have a war with France, and Alexander Hamilton at the head of the army, and then president of the United States. Peace with France was therefore treason." "This transaction," he exclaimed in relation to the appointment of a new mission, "must be transmitted to posterity as the most disinterested, prudent, and successful conduct in my whole life!"

Death of Washington.

At the close of the year — it was also the close of the century which he adorned — Washington died, (December 14, 1799.) His retirement, to which he had looked forward so longingly, had been disturbed. He had been greatly occupied with the organization of the provisional army, of which he had been appointed chief — the last of his many services to his country. He had been still more harassed by the party passions of the time; himself inclined to the support of federalist principles, he had been to some degree drawn into the whirl of political movements. Perhaps it was not too soon for his

peace or for his fame that he was taken away. Beside his grave his countrymen stood united for an instant; then returned to their divisions and their strifes. His memory continued to plead, and not unavailingly, for love of country and of countrymen.

The French mission.

The envoys to France reached their destination in the beginning of the following year, (1800.) They found Napoleon Bonaparte first consul. With his government, after some difficulty, they concluded a convention, providing in part for mutual redress, but leaving many of the questions between the two nations for future settlement, (October.) When brought before the Senate of the United States, the convention was modified by cancelling the provision for additional negotiations. This was assented to in France, on condition that the claims for indemnities on either side should be abandoned. The effect was soon seen in claims for French spoliations presented to the government of the United States. But the treaty sufficed to restore peace.

Difficulties with Spain.

France was not the only foreign power with which there had been difficulties. Spain, aggrieved, as she professed herself to be, by the same British treaty that had offended France, regarded the United States not only as an unimportant but as an untrustworthy ally. The former troubles in connection with the Florida territory continued, especially upon the subject of a boundary between it and the United States. New troubles, too, arose. Vague projects to get possession of the Mississippi valley, by dint of intrigue amongst the western settlers, were ascribed, and not without reason, to the Spaniards. Thus, on both sides there were suspicions, on both contentions.

The country at which Spain appeared to be aiming was rapidly organized by the United States. The Mississippi

Mississippi Territory: slavery under debate.

Territory was formed, including at first the lower part of the present Alabama and Mississippi, (1798.) This organization excited a debate concerning slavery, which, as the organizing act provided, was not to be prohibited in the territory. Here was no such plea as had existed in the case of the Territory South of the Ohio. No cession from a state, no conditions laid any restraint upon Congress. Yet but twelve votes were given in favor of an amendment proposed by George Thacher, of Massachusetts, prohibiting the introduction of slavery into the territory. The most that Congress would agree to, was to forbid the importation of slaves from abroad; a concession, inasmuch as the slave trade, it will be remembered, was still allowed by the Constitution. So, for the second time, and this time without its being required by terms with any state,* the decision of the national government was given in favor of slavery. Let it be borne in mind, when we come to the controversies of later years.

Territory of Indiana: slavery again.

But Congress took the other side, likewise. The western portion of the North-west Territory soon needed to be set off as the Territory of Indiana, embracing the present Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan, (1800.) There slavery was already prohibited. But this went against the interests of the inhabitants, as they thought, and they petitioned Congress, within three and again within seven years after the organization of the territory, to be allowed to introduce slaves amongst them. Once a committee of Congress reported adversely; but twice a report was made in favor of the petition. Reports and

* The part of the territory at this time organized was claimed by the United States as a portion of the old Florida domain. Georgia likewise claimed it as hers; and when she surrendered what was allowed to be hers, that is, the upper part of the present Alabama and Mississippi, she made it a condition that slavery should not be prohibited, (1802.)

petitions, however, were alike fruitless. Congress would not authorize slavery where it had been prohibited.

War with Tripoli. Jefferson's administration opened with fresh aggressions from abroad. The Bey of Tripoli — a treaty with whom had been purchased under Washington's administration — now declared war, undoubtedly for the purpose of exacting larger tribute, (1801.) The war continued for four years, with many gallant actions on the part of the American navy, but without any important results. Peace was made, with an exchange of prisoners, and, as the American prisoners were more numerous, with a ransom to the Tripolitan government, (1805.)

Acquisition of Louisiana. Much nearer home were the continued difficulties with Spain. The Spanish transfer to France of Louisiana — the vast and undefined region on the west of the Mississippi — aggravated the inflamed relations between Spain and the United States, (1800.) It was while the province was still held by the Spanish authorities, that the Americans were excluded from New Orleans as a depot for the commerce of their western country, (1802.) Apprehensions were felt that the west itself was again in danger, and not merely from the designs of Spain, but still more from those of France. A proposal for seizing New Orleans was brought up in the United States Senate; but it was determined to intrust the matter to the executive. The plan was to purchase that portion of Louisiana which included New Orleans, together, perhaps, with a part or the whole of the Floridas, then supposed to be included in the Spanish cession. But the envoys to France — Robert R. Livingston and James Monroe — finding the French government disposed to part with the whole of their recent acquisition, decided to take it all for fifteen millions of dollars, one quarter of the sum to be paid to American sufferers by French spoliations, (April 30, 1803.)

Troubles abroad and at home.

Spain protested against the transaction immediately, and subsequently took up arms to maintain her boundaries, threatened, as she considered, by the Americans both on the side of Florida and on that of Mexico. The United States would have ended the disputes about Florida by purchasing that province; but Spain refused to part with it, and the two nations continued on uncertain terms for many years. Far more alarming were the controversies excited by the acquisition of Louisiana within the United States themselves. The republican chief magistrate, with his theories of a limited general government, had made use of a power far beyond any claimed by the federalists for his predecessors. Jefferson himself allowed it to be "an act beyond the Constitution," and hinted at "an act of indemnity," that is, a constitutional amendment to authorize his proceedings. The Senate ratified the purchase, (October 20.) But loud and angry was the clamor of the opposition, although the opposition, had they been true to their professions, should have been the first to applaud a measure so much after their own system. The party bitterness of the time is almost incredible. Not content with the old divisions, men entered into new ones; the dominant party, the republican, being divided and subdivided. Nor were partisans satisfied with speaking, writing, or acting against one another; they shot down their antagonists in duels and murderous affrays. It was amidst these troubles abroad and at home, while Spain was excited, and the parties of the United States inflamed, that the acquisition of Louisiana was completed.

Chief point involved in the acquisition.

The possession of the Mississippi to its mouth, and the consequent security of the western territory, were the principal points insisted upon by those who supported the acquisition. With those who opposed it, the enlargement of territory and the viola-

tion of the Constitution were the great arguments. Neither party laid much if any stress upon the point which we of the present day can see to have been the chief one involved in the whole transaction. This was the extension of slavery, not, as in the cases previously noticed, by the organization of the national territory, but by the annexation of a foreign region already containing upwards of fifty thousand slaves, and open, of course, to fifty times as many in the progress of years. Of what depended upon this we shall see more hereafter.

Organization of Louisiana territories.

The immense region thus acquired was divided into two portions, (1804.) The southern, in which all the settlements of any importance were included, was called the Territory of Orleans. It comprehended the present State of Louisiana, but with very indefinite boundaries on the west. North of this lay the District of Louisiana, embracing the present Arkansas and Missouri, with as much more as could be brought within its elastic limits on the north and west, its principal settlement being St. Louis. This district was made a part of the same jurisdiction with the Indiana Territory, from which, however, it was soon detached, (1805.) At the same time, the provisions for the Territory of Orleans, complained of by some of the inhabitants, were rendered more liberal. The terms of the treaty concluding the purchase had been these: "The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States, and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States; and in the mean time shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and the religion which they profess." Treaties of this kind were not every-day occurrences with Napoleon.

Other territorial and state organizations.

The new State of Ohio was already admitted to the Union, (November 29, 1802.) New territories — Michigan (1805) and Illinois (1809) — were subsequently formed from out of the Indiana Territory. The signs of expansion were written every where, but nowhere so strikingly as along the western plains.

Burr's projects.

There they were such as to kindle projects of a new empire. Aaron Burr, vice president during Jefferson's first term, but displaced in the second term by George Clinton, (1805,) — branded, too, with the recent murder of Alexander Hamilton in a duel, — was generally avoided amongst his old associates. Turning his face westward, he there drew into his net various men, some of position and some of obscurity, with whose aid he seems to have intended making himself master of the Mississippi valley, or of Mexico, one or both, (1806.) Whatever his schemes were, they miscarried. A handful only of followers were gathered round him on the banks of the Mississippi, a hundred miles or more above New Orleans, when he surrendered himself to the government of the Mississippi Territory, (January, 1807.) Some months afterwards he was brought to trial for high treason before Chief Justice Marshall, of the Supreme Court, with whom sat the district judge for Virginia; the reason for trying Burr in that state being the fact that one of the places where he was charged with having organized a military expedition was within the Virginian limits. The trial, like every thing else in those days, was made a party question; the administration and its supporters going strongly against Burr, while its opponents were disposed to take his part. He was acquitted for want of proof; and for the same reason he was again acquitted when tried for undertaking to invade the Spanish territories.

Difficulties with Great Britain.

Frowning high above all these domestic events were the aggressions from abroad. If they sank in one direction, they seemed sure to rise the more threateningly in another. It was now the turn of Great Britain. That state, however, had never ceased to make such use or abuse of its strength as it pleased — not even after the treaty under Washington's administration; the treaty, as formerly mentioned, having left many matters of controversy undecided. The system of impressment, for instance, though protested against by the United States, had never been renounced by Great Britain. On the contrary, it had been extended even to the American navy, of which the vessels were once and again plundered of their seamen by British men-of-war. Another subject on which Great Britain set herself against the claims of the United States, was the neutral trade, of which the latter nation engrossed a large and constantly increasing share during the European wars. After various attempts to discourage American commerce with her enemies, Great Britain undertook to put it down by condemning vessels of the United States on the ground that their cargoes were not neutral but belligerent property; in other words, that the Americans transported goods which were not their own, but those of nations at war with Great Britain. It must be allowed that the American shippers played a close game, importing merchandise only to get a neutral name for it, and then exporting it to the country to which it could not be shipped directly from its place of origin. But the sharper the practice, the more of a favorite it seemed to be. A cry went up from all the commercial towns of the United States, appealing to the government for protection, (1805.)

Mission.

Government could do but little. It passed a law prohibiting the importation of certain articles from Great Britain; the prohibition, however, not to take imme-

diate effect. This, it was thought, would so far intimidate the British authorities as to produce a suspension of their high-handed proceedings. At the same time, a mission, consisting of James Monroe and William Pinkney, was sent to London, to negotiate a new treaty, in which the disputed points should be included, (April, 1806.) "I hope," wrote Jefferson to Monroe, "that the ministry will come to just arrangements. No two countries upon earth have so many points of common interest and friendship; and their rulers must be bunglers indeed, if with such dispositions they break them asunder." But the mission proved a total failure. In the first place, the envoys could obtain no satisfaction on the subject of impressment, and next to none on that of the neutral trade. In the next place, the treaty which they signed, notwithstanding these omissions, was at once rejected by President Jefferson, without even a reference to the Senate, (March, 1807.) The tumult of party that ensued was immense. The president was charged with sacrificing the best interests of the country, as well as with violating the plainest provisions of the Constitution. Was it he alone who held the treaty-making power, — he, too, the republican, who had insisted upon restraining the powers of the executive? But looking back upon the action of Jefferson, we see little in it to have provoked such outcries. He sent envoys to form a new treaty; they had merely reformed an old one. It might be rash to sacrifice the advantages which they had gained; but might it not be ignominious to surrender the claims which they had passed by?

Affair of the Chesapeake.

If the nation needed to be convinced of the necessity of some definite understanding with Great Britain on the subjects omitted in the rejected treaty, it soon had an opportunity. The American frigate Chesapeake, sailing from Hampton Roads, was hailed off the capes of Chesapeake Bay by the British frigate Leopard,

the captain of which demanded to search the Chesapeake for deserters from the service of Great Britain. Captain Barron, the commander of the Chesapeake, refused; whereupon the Leopard opened fire. As Barron and his crew were totally unprepared for action, they fired but a single gun, to save their honor, then, having lost several men, struck their flag. The British commander took those of whom he was in search, three of the four being Americans, and left the Chesapeake to make her way back dishonored, and the nation to which she belonged dishonored likewise, (June 22, 1807.) The president issued a proclamation, ordering British men-of-war from the waters of the United States. Instructions were sent to the envoys at London, directing them, not merely to seek reparation for the wrong that had been done, but to obtain the renunciation of the pretensions to a right of search and of impressment, from which the wrong had sprung. The British government recognized their responsibility, by sending a special minister to settle the difficulty at Washington. It was four years, however, before the desired reparation was procured, (1811.) The desired renunciation was never made. One can scarcely credit his eyes, when he reads that the affair of the Chesapeake was made a party point. But so it was. The friends of Great Britain, the capitalists and commercial classes, generally, murmured at the course of their government, as too decided, too French, they sometimes called it; as if the slightest resistance to Great Britain were subordination to France.

Aspect of Great Britain and France.

The aspect of the two nations was very much changed of late years. Bonaparte, the consul of the French republic, had become Napoleon, the emperor of the French empire. Regarded by his enemies as a monster steeped in despotism and in blood, he excited abhorrence, not only for himself, but for his nation,

amongst a large portion of the Americans. On the other hand, Great Britain, formerly scouted at as the opponent of liberty, was now generally considered its champion in Europe. There was but a faint comprehension of the principles involved in the struggle between Great Britain and France, of the real attitude taken by the former in warring against the chosen sovereign of the latter, or of the remorseless ambition by which the one government was quite as much actuated as the other. But there was still a very considerable number in America to sympathize with France, if with either of the contending powers. To these men, the aggressions of Great Britain were intolerable; while to the supporters of the British, the French aggressions were far the more unendurable.

British and French aggressions.

Both parties had their fill. Before the attack on the Chesapeake, the lists had been opened between France and England, to see, not merely how much harm they could do to each other, but how much they could inflict upon all allied or connected with each other. Connected with both were the Americans, who were now assailed by both. Great Britain led off by declaring the French ports, from Brest to the Elbe, closed to American as to all other shipping, (May 16, 1806.) France retorted by the Berlin decree, so called because issued from Prussia, prohibiting any commerce with Great Britain, (November 21.) That power immediately forbade the coasting trade between one port and another in the possession of her enemies, (January 7, 1807.) Not satisfied with this, she went on to forbid all trade whatsoever with France and her allies, except on payment of a tribute to Great Britain, each vessel to pay in proportion to its cargo, (November 11.) Then followed the Milan decree of Napoleon, prohibiting all trade whatsoever with Great Britain, and declaring such vessels as paid the recently

demanded tribute to be lawful prizes to the French marine, (December 17.) Such was the series of acts thundering like broadsides against the interests of America. It transformed commerce from a peaceful pursuit into a warlike one — full of peril, of loss, of strife. It did more. It wounded the national honor, by attempting to prostrate the United States at the mercy of the European powers.

The administration against war.

There was but one of two courses for the United States to take — peace or preparation for war. War itself was impossible in the unprovided state of the country; but to assume a defensive, and if need were, to get ready for an offensive position, was perfectly practicable. Jefferson thought it enough to order an additional number of gunboats — very different from the gunboats of our time, and yet considered by the administration and its supporters to constitute a navy by themselves. The president did not favor any thing that looked like war. He had come into office with denunciations of the proceedings of the Adams administration against France; nor did the circumstances in which the nation was now situated smooth the way to hostilities with any foreign power. "In the present maniac state of Europe," he wrote a little later, "I should not estimate the point of honor by the ordinary scale. I believe we shall, on the contrary, have credit with the world for having made the avoidance of being engaged in the present unexampled war our first object. War, however, may become a less losing business than unresisted depredation." There remained the alternative of peace.

Embargo.

To preserve it, the president hit upon the most self-denying of plans. The aggressions of the European powers were directed against the commerce of America, the rights of owners and of crews. That these might be secured, the president recommended, and Congress adopted, an embargo upon all United States vessels, and

upon all foreign vessels with cargoes shipped after the passage of the act in United States ports, (December 22, 1807.) * In other words, as commerce led to injuries from foreign nations, commerce was to be abandoned. There was also the idea that the foreign nations themselves would suffer from the loss of American supplies and American prizes. It was a singular way, one must allow, of preserving peace, to adopt a measure at once provoking to the stranger, and destructive to the citizen. The latter eluded it, and it was again and again enforced by severe and even arbitrary statutes. The former laughed it to scorn. France, on whose side the violent federalists declared the embargo to be, answered by a decree of Napoleon's from Bayonne, ordering the confiscation of all American vessels in French ports, (April 17, 1808.) Great Britain soon after made her response, by an order prohibiting the exportation of American produce, whether paying tribute or not, to the European continent, (December 21.) So ineffective abroad, so productive of discontent at home, even amongst the supporters of the administration, did the embargo prove, that it was repealed, (March, 1809.)

Succeeding acts.

Thus neither preserving peace nor preparing for war, Jefferson gave up the conduct of affairs to his successor, Madison, who kept on the same course. In place of the embargo were non-intercourse or non-importation acts in relation to Great Britain and France, as restrictive as the embargo, so far as the designated nations were concerned, but leaving free the trade with other countries. These successors of the embargo, however, were nowise more effectual than that had been. They were reviled and violated in America; they were contemned in Europe.

* The date shows that the embargo was laid before the news of the last violent decrees of France and Great Britain.

The administration amused itself with suspending the restrictions, now in favor of Great Britain, (1809,) and now in favor of France, (1810,) hoping to induce those powers to reciprocate the compliment by a suspension of their own aggressive orders. There was a show of doing so. Napoleon had recently issued a decree from Rambouillet, ordering the sale of more than a hundred American vessels as condemned prizes, (March 23, 1810.) But on the news from America, willing to involve the young nation in hostilities with Great Britain, he intimated his readiness to retract the decrees of which the United States complained. But he would not do so, he made known, except on one of two conditions; either the British orders must be recalled, or else, in case of their not being recalled, the claims of the United States must be enforced against them. To all this, Great Britain replied, that when the French decrees were actually, and not conditionally, revoked, her orders should be revoked likewise. It was but a mockery on both sides; and America, mortified, but not yet enlightened, returned to her prohibitions. They were scoffed at by her own people.

Opposition. It is not so difficult to describe as to conceive the hue and cry, on the part of the opposition, against the embargo and the subsequent acts. Whatever discontent, whatever nullification had been expressed by the republicans against the war measures of Adams, was rivalled, if not outrivalled by the federalists against the so-called peace measures of Jefferson and Madison. Town meetings, state legislatures, even the courts in some places, declared against the constitutionality and the validity of the embargo statutes. The federalists of Massachusetts were charged with the design of dissolving the Union. It was not their intention, but their language had warranted its being imputed to them. "Choose, then, fellow-citizens,"

their legislature exclaimed, "between the condition of a free state, possessing its equal weight and influence in the general government, or that of a colony, free in name, but in fact enslaved by sister states."

Indian hostilities.

While affairs, domestic and foreign, were thus agitated, there came a fresh outbreak of Indian hostilities. It was under Jefferson that the plan of removing the Indians to the west was begun, (1804.) Of this the main object was to secure the continuance of peace, it being at that time comparatively unimportant to extend the national domains. But it was this very plan, though as yet imperfectly developed, that led, at least in part, to renewed warfare. Two chiefs of the Shawanoes, Tecumseh and his twin brother, styled the Prophet, for some time settled on the Tippecanoe River, in the Indiana Territory, had set themselves at the head of a sort of confederacy amongst the western races. But for the profane pretensions of the Prophet, and the unscrupulous intrigues of Tecumseh, the principles of the league would have deserved success. One great point was the title of the Indians, as a whole, to the lands of which the whites were getting possession, by bargains with individuals or with individual tribes. Another was the prohibition of the ardent spirits with which the traders were destroying the Indians, body and soul. But to support these principles, the confederates, or their leaders, relied upon treachery and terror, superstition and blasphemy. The governor of Indiana Territory, William H. Harrison, marched against them with a force of a few hundred. Tecumseh was absent at the time, but his brother and his confederates were overtaken. To the last, they professed peace, then fell upon the camp of the Americans. They were expected, however, and were routed, (November 7, 1811.)

The steel was glistening upon the southern frontier. An

Louisiana and Florida.

insurrection against the Spanish authority in West Florida had been followed by a presidential proclamation declaring the territory on the east bank of the Mississippi a portion of Louisiana, (October, 1810.) Soon after, (January, 1811,) Congress authorized the acquisition of the entire province of Florida, provided either that Spain consented to it, or that any other power attempted to take possession. Without any actual collision, the Spanish garrisons and the American troops were too near one another to favor peace. It did not lessen the excitement in that quarter, when Louisiana, with a large portion of Florida, according to the Spanish claim, was admitted a state, (April 8, 1812.) The District of Louisiana in the north then took the name of Missouri. Another slice of Florida was annexed to the Mississippi Territory, while an insurrection within the remaining Florida limits was stimulated by an American functionary; a demonstration being made against St. Augustine. This was promptly disavowed by the government at Washington; but the troops from the states were not withdrawn until the following year, nor then entirely, Mobile being retained by way of compensation for what was surrendered, (1813.)

Warlike preparations against Great Britain.

In both the Florida and the Indian difficulties, British agency was suspected and inveighed against by the excited Americans. The angry feelings between the two nations had received a further stimulus from an encounter of the American frigate President with the British sloop of war Little Belt, in which the latter suffered severely; the only reason alleged by either of the vessels for firing being an informality in hailing, (May, 1811.) It was plain that war was becoming popular in the United States. As for that, it had always been so; when Washington opposed it, he was abused; when Adams favored it, he was extolled; when Jefferson

avoided it, he risked even his immense influence over the nation. Congress now took up the question, and voted one measure after another, preparatory to hostilities with Great Britain, (December — March, 1812.) The president hesitated. He was no war leader by nature or by principle; the only tendency in that direction came to him from party motives. His party, or the more active portion of it, was all for arms; when he doubted, they urged; when he inclined to draw back, they drove him forward. It being the time when the congressional caucus was about to nominate for the presidency, Madison received the intimation that if he was a candidate for reëlection, he must come out for war. Whether it was to force or to his own free will that he yielded, he did yield, and sent a message to Congress, recommending an embargo of sixty days. Congress received it, according to its intention, as a preliminary to war, and voted it, though far from unanimously, for ninety days, (April 4, 1812.)

Termination of preceding strifes.

It was the natural termination of the preceding strifes, continued now for twenty years. What Washington had been able to suppress, because he stood above mere party motives, that neither Adams, nor Jefferson, nor Madison had been able to meet. They yielded, more or less, but all in some degree, to party what they should have maintained for the nation. From the very beginning, when Adams held office, the result was war with France; the result of the controversies under Jefferson and under Madison was war with Great Britain. Nor let it be set down as an exaggeration, that war should be thus attributed to party movements at home, rather than to the national aggressions from abroad. The latter, it is true, were the material upon which parties and administrations acted; but what would have become of the material, had

parties and administrations been at peace? Would any foreign power have so assailed the nation, had it been united? Or would it, if assailed, have borne its injuries so long, that there remained no alternative but arms? It is an impressive lesson of the effects of disunion.

CHAPTER II.

War with Great Britain.

Declaration. A message from the president called the attention of Congress to the relations with Great Britain and with France. The former power, violating all individual rights by its impressments, and all national ones by its blockades, its orders against neutrals, and its captures, was virtually at war with the United States. Nor could France be said to be at peace, while she continued her seizures of American vessels, notwithstanding the repeal of the decrees against neutral commerce. With her, however, there was some hope of successful negotiation; in fact, conferences were now going on at Paris. But with Great Britain, the message implied little prospect of coming to terms. Congress took up the subject. Motions to include France in the course proposed with respect to Great Britain were made, but lost. Against Great Britain, war was voted by Congress, (June 18,) and declared by the president, (June 19, 1812.)

Cause of the United States. The United States went to war for two great principles; one, the rights of neutrals, the other, the rights of seamen; both involving the honor and the independence of the nation. To admit the necessity of the principles, however, is not to admit the necessity of the war as the means of sustaining them. France having again — and this time unconditionally — repealed her aggressive decrees, Great Britain withdrew

her arbitrary orders in council just as the war was declared, (June 23.) One of the chief grounds for hostilities, therefore, fell through. The other remained, but only, it was insisted by Great Britain, until the United States would take some measures to prevent British seamen from enlisting in the American service, which being done, there would be no need of search or of impressment by the navy of Great Britain. This very thing was begun upon, though not until several months after the outbreak of war.* At the beginning, the American minister at London was instructed to propose an armistice, on condition that the claims of impressment and of neutral subjection were waived. The British government rejected the proposal, principally on the score of impressment, which they would not yield or even suspend during negotiation. For the reason that they would not do so, their proposals of an armistice, through their commanders in America, were rejected by the United States, (June — October.) We must fight, cried the war party, if it is only for our seamen; six thousand of them are victims to these atrocious impressments. The British government had admitted, the year before, that they had sixteen hundred Americans in their service. But your six thousand, retorted the advocates of peace, are not all your own; there are foreigners, British subjects, amongst them; and will you fight for these? We will, was the reply — and here the sympathy of every generous heart must be theirs, so far as they were sincere — the stranger who comes to dwell or to toil amongst us is as much our own as if he were born in America.

A party cause.

But the cause of the United States cannot be said to have been so broad or so noble as the

* But the prohibition of foreign enlistments was made to depend upon certain conditions, which were not fulfilled.

protection of those who had sought an asylum in the land. It was not even the cause of the nation itself, to judge by the way in which it was maintained. It was what might have been expected from the movements leading to it — the cause of a party, nominally headed by Madison, the president, by James Monroe, the secretary of state, by Albert Gallatin, (the same who appeared in the Pennsylvania insurrection of Washington's time,) the secretary of the treasury, and by others, officers or supporters of the administration, both in and out of Congress; but the real leaders of the war party were younger men, some risen to distinction, like Henry Clay, speaker of the House of Representatives, and John C. Calhoun, member of the same body, but many more aspiring to place in the council or in the camp, to place any where, so that there was an opening to the fame or to the emolument for which they variously yearned.

As such opposed.

The party support which the war received explains the party opposition which it encountered. The signal, given by a protest from the federalist members of Congress, was caught up and repeated in public meetings and at private hearth-stones. Even the pulpit threw open its doors to political harangues, and those not of the mildest sort. "The alternative then is," exclaimed a clergyman at Boston, "that if you do not wish to become the slaves of those who own slaves, and who are themselves the slaves of French slaves, you must either, in the language of the day, cut the connection, or so far alter the national Constitution as to secure yourselves a due share in the government. The Union has long since been virtually dissolved, and it is full time that this portion of the United States should take care of itself." This single extract must stand here for a thousand others that might be cited. Coming from the source that it did, it is a striking illustration of the sectionality, nay, the personal vindictiveness, with which the oppo-

sition was animated. Strongest in New England, where alone the federalist party still retained its power, the hostility to the war spread through all parts of the country, gathering many of otherwise conflicting views around the banner that had so long been trailing in the dust. If we cannot sympathize with the party thus reviving, we need not join in the tumult raised against it on the score of treachery or dishonor. The federalists opposed the war, not because they were anti-national, but because they thought it anti-national.

War at home.

The war began at home. The office of a federalist paper, the Federal Republican, conducted by Alexander Hanson, at Baltimore, was sacked by a mob, who then went on to attack dwellings, pillage vessels, and, finally, to fire the house of an individual suspected of partialities for Great Britain, (June 22, 23.) A month later, Hanson opened another office, and prepared to defend it, with the assistance of his friends, against the assault which he felt sure his boldness would provoke. The mob came, and, after a night of horror, forced the party in the office to yield themselves prisoners on a charge of murder. The next night the prison was assailed; Hanson and his friends, excepting some who escaped, being beaten and tortured with indescribable fury. General Henry Lee, a revolutionary hero, who had taken the lead in the measures of defence, was injured for life. Another soldier of the revolution, General Lingan, was actually slain; a fate which would have been shared by many, but for the exhaustion of the destroyers, (July 26, 27.) All this was done with nothing more than the show of interference on the part of the authorities. Even at the subsequent trial of the ringleaders in the mob, they were acquitted. Hanson kept up his paper only by removing to Georgetown.

Such being the passions, such the divisions internally, the

Means for the war.

nation needed more than the usual panoply to protect itself externally. But it had less. The colonies of 1775 did not go to war more unprepared than the United States of 1812. There was no army to speak of. Generals abounded, it is true, Henry Dearborn, late secretary of war, being at the head of the list; but troops were few and far between, some thousands of regulars and of volunteers constituting the entire force. As to the militia, there were grave differences to prevent its efficient employment. In the first place, there was a general distrust of such bodies of troops. In the next place, there were local controversies, between certain of the state authorities and the general government, as to the power of the latter to call out the militia in the existing state of things.* If the army was inconsiderable, the navy was hardly perceptible, embracing only eight or ten frigates, as many more smaller vessels, and a flotilla of comparatively useless gunboats. The national finances were in a correspondingly low condition. The revenue, affected by the interruptions to commerce during the preceding years, needed all the stimulants which it could obtain, even in time of peace. It was wholly inadequate to the exigencies of war. Accordingly, resort was had to loans, then to direct taxes and licenses, (1813.) But the ways and means fell far short of the demands upon them. In fine, whether we take a financial or a military point of view, we find the country equally unfitted for hostilities. It might rely, indeed, upon its own inherent energies, the energies of six millions of freemen;† but even these were distracted, and to a great degree paralyzed.

* The Constitution authorizing Congress "to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions."

† The census of 1810 gave a total of 7,239,814, of which 1,191,364 were slaves.

Position of Great Britain.

Fortunate, therefore, was it that Great Britain was occupied, it may be said absorbed, in Europe. Her mighty struggle with Napoleon was at its height when the United States declared war. To British ears the declaration sounded much the same as the wail of a child amidst the contentions of men. Very little heed was paid to it, the retraction of the orders in council being considered as likely to end it altogether. But to the astonishment of the British government the Americans persisted. Let them wait, was the tone, until Bonaparte is crushed, and they shall have their turn.

Of France.

The charge fell again and again upon the United States administration, from its opponents, that it was entering into war as the ally, or rather as the minion, of France. The charge was unfounded. Even had it been intended by the war party to go to the aid of Napoleon, they would have been stopped, partly by his utter indifference at the time, and partly by his declining fortunes in the months that ensued. He and his nation had no mind to look beyond their own vicissitudes.

The war. Losses on north-western frontier.

Notwithstanding the almost entire want of means, the United States government determined to carry the war into the enemy's country. For this purpose, William Hull, general and governor of Michigan Territory, crossed from Detroit to Sandwich, in Canada, with about two thousand men, (July 12.) In a little more than a month, he had not only retreated, but surrendered, without a blow, to General Brock, the governor of Lower Canada, (August 16.) The British, already in possession of the northern part of Michigan, were soon masters of the entire territory. So far from being able to recover it, General Harrison, who made the attempt in the ensuing autumn and winter, found it all he could do to save Ohio from falling with Michigan. A detachment of Kentuckians yielded

to a superior force of British at Frenchtown, on the River Raisin, (January, 1813;) whereupon Harrison took post by the Maumee, at Fort Meigs, holding out there against the British and their Indian allies, (April, May.) The same fort was again assailed and again defended, General Clay being at that time in command, (July.) Fort Stevenson, on the Sandusky, was then attacked, but defended with great spirit and success by a small garrison under Major Croghan, (August.) Yet Ohio was still in danger.

Perry's victory on Lake Erie.

It was rescued by different operations from those as yet described. Captain Chauncey, after gathering a little fleet on Lake Ontario, where he achieved some successes, appointed Lieutenant Oliver H. Perry to the command on Lake Erie. Perry's first duty was to provide a fleet; his next, to lead it, when provided, against the British vessels under Captain Barclay. At length the squadrons met off Sandusky, the British to suffer total defeat, the Americans to win complete victory, (September 10, 1813.) It was in more than official language that the president communicated this achievement to Congress. "The conduct of Captain Perry," he said, "adroit as it was daring, and which was so well seconded by his comrades, justly entitles them to the admiration and gratitude of their country, and will fill an early page in its naval annals with a victory never surpassed in lustre, however much it may have been in magnitude." It was a victory on a small scale. Yet its importance immediately appeared. Taking on board a body of troops from Ohio and Kentucky, under Harrison, Perry transported them to the neighborhood of Sandwich, on the Canada shore, the same spot against which Hull had marched more than a twelvemonth before. The British having retired, Harrison crossed to Detroit. Recrossing, he advanced in pursuit of the much less numerous enemy, whose rear and whose main body were routed

on two successive days, (October 4, 5.) The latter action, on the bank of the Thames, was decisive; the British General Proctor making his escape with but a small portion of his troops, while his Indian ally, Tecumseh, was slain. Ohio was thus saved, and Michigan recovered; though not entirely, the British still holding the northern extremity of the territory.

Operations on New York frontier.

All along the frontier between New York and Canada, there had been from the first some scattered forces, both American and British. The former pretended to act on the offensive, but amidst continual failures. Chief of these movements without interest and without result, was an attack against Queenstown, on the Canada shore of the Niagara River. Advanced parties gained possession of a battery on the bank, but there they were checked, and at length obliged to surrender, for want of support from their comrades on the American side. General Van Rensselaer was the American, General Brock the British commander; the latter falling in battle, the former resigning in disgust after the battle was over, (October 13, 1812.) In the following spring, General Dearborn and the land troops, in conjunction with Chauncey and the fleet, took York, (now Toronto,) the capital of Upper Canada, burning the Parliament House, and then proceeding successfully against the forts on the Niagara River, (April, May, 1813.) At this point, however, affairs took an unfavorable turn. The British mustered strong, and, though repulsed from Sackett's Harbor by General Brown, at the head of some regular troops and volunteers, they obtained the command of the lake, making descents in various places, and reducing the American forces, both land and naval, to comparative inactivity, (June.) Months afterwards, the land forces, now under the lead of General Wilkinson, started on a long-proposed expedition against Montreal;

but encountering resistance on the way down the St. Lawrence, went straight into winter quarters within the New York frontier. A body of troops under General Hampton, moving in the same direction from Lake Champlain, met with a feint of opposition, rather than opposition itself, from the British; it was sufficient, however, to induce a retreat, (November.) Both these armies far outnumbered the enemy, Wilkinson having seventy-five hundred, and Hampton forty-five hundred men under them. On the western border of New York, things went still worse. General M'Clure, left in charge of the Niagara frontier, was so weakened by the loss of men at the expiration of their terms of service, and at the same time so pressed by the enemy, as to abandon the Canada shore, leaving behind him the ruins of Fort George and of the village of Newark. The destruction thus wreaked by orders of the government was avenged upon the New York borders. Parties of British and Indians, crossing the frontier at different places, took Fort Niagara, at the mouth of the river, and swept the adjacent country with fire and sword as far as Buffalo, (December.) Glutted with success, the invaders retired, save from Fort Niagara, which they held until the end of the war. In the following spring, (March, 1814,) General Wilkinson emerged from his retreat, and, with a portion of his troops, undertook to carry the approaches to Canada from the side of Lake Champlain. But on coming up with a stone mill held by British troops, he abruptly withdrew. A more helpless group than that of the Americans, whether commanders, officers, or soldiers, on the New York frontier, cannot well be conceived. There were exceptions, of course, as in the fleets of Ontario, and especially of Erie; but on shore there was almost unbroken imbecility. The secretary of war himself, General Armstrong, had been upon the ground; he but confirmed the rule.

On Niagara frontier. As the war, thus pitiably prosecuted, entered into its third year, (1814,) a concentration of efforts, both American and British, took place upon the Niagara frontier. General Brown, the defender of Sackett's Harbor, obtaining the command, and with such supporters as General Scott and other gallant officers, resolved upon crossing to the Canada side. There, with an army of some thirty-five hundred men, he took Fort Erie, (July 2,) gained the battle of Chippewa, (July 5,) and drove the enemy, under General Riall, from the frontier, save from a single stronghold, Fort George. The British, however, on being reënforced, returned under Generals Riall and Drummond, and met the Americans at Bridgewater — the most of an action that had as yet been fought during the war. It was within the roar of Niagara that the opposing lines crossed their swords and opened their batteries. Begun by Scott, in advance of the main body, which soon came up under Brown, the battle was continued until midnight, to the advantage of the American army, (July 25.) But they were unable to follow up or even to maintain their success, and fell back upon Fort Erie. Thither the British proceeded, and after a night assault, laid siege to the place, then under the command of General Gaines. As soon as Brown, who had withdrawn to recover from his wounds, resumed his command at the fort, he at once ordered a sortie, the result being the raising of the siege, (September 17.) He was soon after called away to defend Sackett's Harbor, the enemy having the upper hand on the lake. His successor in command on the Niagara frontier, General Izard, blew up Fort Erie, and abandoned the Canada shore, (November.)

Meanwhile the American arms had distinguished themselves on the side of Lake Champlain. Thither descended the British General Prevost with twelve thousand soldiers,

Defence of Lake Champlain.

lately arrived from Europe, his object being to carry the American works at Plattsburg, and to drive the American vessels from the waters. He was totally unsuccessful. Captain McDonough, after long exertions, had constructed a fleet, with which he now met and overwhelmed the British squadron. The land attack upon the few thousand regulars and militia under General Macomb was hardly begun before it was given over in consequence of the naval action, (September 11.) No engagement in the war, before or after, was more unequal in point of force, the British being greatly the superiors; yet none was more decisive.

British superiority.

The British superiority observable at Lake Champlain and elsewhere requires a word of explanation. Napoleon, fallen some months before, had left the armies and fleets of Great Britain free to act in other scenes than those to which they had been so long confined. The war with the United States had acquired no new importance in sight of the British authorities; but it was time to crush the adversary that had dared to brave them. The troops transported to America — some to Canada, as we have seen, some to other places, as we shall soon see — were superior to the Americans generally in numbers, and always in appointments and in discipline. They were the men to whom France had succumbed; it must have seemed impossible that the United States should resist them.

Successes at sea.

The apprehensions of the enemy, aroused by some of the operations on land, had been highly excited by some of those at sea. Before the gallant actions upon the lakes, a succession of remarkable exploits had occurred upon the ocean. It had been the policy of the republican administration to keep down the navy which their federalist predecessors had encouraged. But the navy, or that fragment of one which remained, returned good for evil. The

frigate Essex, under Captain Porter, took the sloop of war Alert off the northern coast, (August 13, 1812;) the frigate Constitution, Captain Isaac Hull, took the frigate Guerrière in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, (August 19;) the sloop of war Wasp, Captain Jones, took the brig Frolic, both, however, falling prizes to the seventy-four Poictiers, not far from the Bermudas, (October 13;) the frigate United States, Captain Decatur, took the frigate Macedonian off the Azores, (October 25;) and the Constitution again, now under Captain Bainbridge, took the frigate Java off Brazil, (December 29.) This series of triumphs was broken by but two reverses, the capture of the brig Nautilus by the British squadron, and that of the brig Vixen by the British frigate Southampton, both off the Atlantic coast. Nothing could be more striking than the effect upon both the nations that were at war. The British started with amazement, not to say terror, at the idea of their ships, their cherished instruments of superiority at sea, yielding to an enemy. The Americans were proportionately animated; better still, they were for once united in a common feeling of pride and national honor.

Subsequent reverses.

Here, however, the impulse ceased, or began to cease. The navy was too inconsiderable to continue the contest, the nation too inactive to recruit its numbers and its powers. The captures of the succeeding period of the war, though made with quite as much gallantry, were of much less importance; while one vessel after another, beginning with the frigate Chesapeake, off Boston harbor, (June 1, 1813,) was forced to strike to the enemy. Many of the larger ships were hemmed in by the British blockade, when this, commencing with the war, was extended along the entire coast. The last glimmer of naval victory for the time was the defeat of the sloop of war Avon by the Wasp, Captain Blakely, off the French coast,

(September 1, 1814.) But a few weeks later, the Wasp was lost with all its crew, leaving not a single vessel of the United States navy on the seas. Every one that had escaped the perils of the ocean and of war was shut up in port behind the greatly superior squadrons of Great Britain.

Losses upon the coast.

The coast, from the first blockaded, and occasionally visited by invading parties of the British, was in an appalling state, (1814.) Eastport was taken; Castine, Belfast, and Machias were seized, with claims against the whole country east of the Penobscot Cape Cod, or some of the towns upon it, had to purchase safety; Stonington was bombarded. Fortifications were hastily thrown up wherever they could be by the Americans; the militia was called out by the states, and the general government was urged to despatch its regular troops to the menaced shores. It was officially announced by the British Admiral Cochrane that he was imperatively instructed "to destroy and lay waste all towns and districts of the United States found accessive to the attack of British armaments." This was not war, but devastation.

Capture of Washington and Alexandria.

The Chesapeake, long a favorite point for the British descents, was now occupied by a large, indeed a double fleet, under Admirals Cochrane and Cockburn, with several thousand land troops and marines under General Ross. This body, landing about fifty miles from Washington, marched against that city, while the American militia retreated hither and thither, making a stand for a few moments only at Bladensburg, (August 24.) On the evening following this rout, the British took possession of Washington, and next day proceeded to carry out the orders announced by the admiral. Stores were destroyed; a frigate and a sloop were burned; the public buildings, including the Capitol, and even the mansion of the president, were plundered and fired. Against

this "unwarrantable extension of the ravages of war," as it is styled by a British writer, the United States had no right to complain, remembering the burning of the Parliament House at York, or the destruction of Newark, in the preceding year, although both these outrages had been already avenged on the New York frontier. A few hours were enough for the work of ruin at Washington, (August 25,) and the British returned to their ships. The same day (August 29) some frigates appeared off Alexandria, and extorted an enormous ransom for the town. Every thing on the American side was helplessness and submission. The president and his cabinet had reviewed the troops, which mustered to the number of several thousands; generals and officers had been thick upon the field; but there was no consistent counsel, no steadfast action, and the country lay as open to the enemy as if it had been uninhabited.

Defence of Baltimore.

It is a relief to turn to Baltimore. Fresh from their marauding victories, the British landed at North Point, some miles below that city. They were too strong for the Americans, who retired, but not until after a bravely contested battle, in which the British commander, General Ross, was slain, (September 12.) As the army advanced against the town, the next day, the fleet bombarded Fort McHenry, an inconsiderable defence just below Baltimore. But the bombardment and the advance proving ineffectual, the invaders retreated. They had been courageously met, triumphantly repelled. North Point and Fort McHenry are names which shine out, like those of Erie and Champlain, brilliant amidst encompassing darkness.

Indian foes.

As if one war were not enough for a nation so hard pressed, another had broken out. The Indians on the north-west, the followers of Tecumseh, and others

besides, were but the allies of the British. Independent foes, fighting altogether for themselves, uprose in the Creeks of the Mississippi Territory, where they surprised some hundreds of Americans at Fort Mimms, (August, 1813.) Numerous bodies of border volunteers at once started for the haunts of the enemy, chief amongst the number being the troops of Tennessee, under General Jackson. Penetrating into the heart of the Creek country, after various bloody encounters, Jackson at length routed the main body of the foe at a place called Tohopeka, (March 27, 1814.) A few months after, he concluded a treaty, by which the Creeks surrendered the larger part of their territory.

National straits.

Enough remained, as has been seen, to keep the nation in sad straits. There were various causes to produce the same effect. To raise the very first essential for carrying on a war, a sufficient army, had been found impossible, notwithstanding all sorts of new provisions to facilitate the operation. It was in vain to increase the bounties, in vain even to authorize the enlistment of minors without the consent of their parents or masters;* all allurements failed. The chief reliance of the government was necessarily upon the militia, about which the same controversies continued as those already mentioned between the federal and the state authorities. Yet, to show the extent to which the opposition party indulged itself in embarrassing the government, an alarm was sounded against the national forces, small though they were, as threatening the liberties of the country. But the army was not the only point of difficulty. To prevent supplies to the forces of the enemy, as well as to cut him off from all advantages of commerce with the United States, a new embargo was laid,

* Rejected, when first proposed to Congress, but afterwards carried, (December, 1814.)

(December, 1813.) So severe were its restrictions, affecting even the coasting trade and the fishery, that Massachusetts called it another Boston port bill, and pronounced it, by her legislature, to be unconstitutional. It was repealed in a few months, and with it the non-importation act, which, in one shape or another, had hung upon the commercial interests of the nation, for years, (April, 1814.) More serious by far were the financial embarrassments of the government. All efforts to relieve the treasury had been wholly inadequate. Loan after loan was contracted; tax after tax was laid, until carriages, furniture, paper, and even watches, were assessed, while plans were formed for other means, such as the creation of a national bank, the earlier one having expired according to the provisions of its charter. But the state to which the finances at length arrived was this, that while eleven millions of revenue were all to be counted upon, — ten from taxes, and only one from custom duties, — fifty millions were needed for the expenditures of the year, (1815.) It did not ease matters when a large number of the banks of the country suspended specie payments, (August, 1814.)

Party controversies.

The opposition to the war had never ceased. It rested, indeed, on foundations too deep to be lightly moved. Below the points immediately relating to the war itself, were the earlier questions arising during the operation of the government, nay, the still earlier ones, that arose with the government — the questions of the Constitution. All these had been brought out into contrast and into collision by the conflict with Great Britain. Such old topics as the relations of the national and the state governments came up for fresh controversy. "The government of the United States," declared the federalist chief magistrate of Massachusetts, "is founded on the state governments, and must be supported by them." There might be

a change of sides; federalists might stand where republicans had stood, and republicans where federalists had done; but the divisions were the same. Even those between the north and the south reappeared, and with wider lines, in the midst of the war, which, as a general rule, the south supported and the north opposed.

Hartford Convention. The idea of a convention of the party, or, as the phrase ran, of the states opposing the war, was started in Massachusetts. So little countenance did it receive, as to be dropped for several months, when increasing trials led to increasing struggles. It was then renewed, but in the more modest guise of "a conference between those states the affinity of whose interests is closest, and whose habits of intercourse from local and other causes are most frequent;" in other words, the New England States; but action upon subjects of a national nature was to be left, should the conference deem it expedient, "to a future convention from all the states in the Union." The Massachusetts legislature appointed twelve delegates to represent her in the conference, and invited her sister states of New England to do likewise, (October, 1814.) Connecticut responded by appointing seven delegates, and designating Hartford as the place for the conference to meet. Rhode Island appointed four delegates; two counties in New Hampshire and one county in Vermont, one delegate each. Twenty-six were chosen, all but two of whom were present on the opening of the conference at Hartford, (December 15.) The other two afterwards appeared, constituting, with the secretary, an assembly of twenty-seven.

Charges of disunion. So small was the body to which an immense importance was attached at and after the time, but rather by its opponents than its adherents. The latter regarded it just as it was, a meeting of men to whom the greater part of New England was glad to intrust its shat-

tered interests, but without any deep-seated expectation of succor, so strong against them was the majority of the nation. To this majority, however, or to its mouthpieces, the assembly at Hartford wore a different aspect. It was the last desperate stake, the administration party urged, of the opposition; lost or won, it hastened the issue of disunion so long suspected as prepared. Whatever extremes the federalists may have fallen into, there is no proof of their intending to separate from their countrymen. The call of the Massachusetts authorities for this very conference at Hartford proposed such deliberations and such measures, only, as were "not repugnant to their obligations as members of the Union." That they were in earnest appears from the proceedings of the conference, or the Convention, as it is generally called.

Proceedings of the Convention.

The Convention, of which George Cabot, of Massachusetts, was the president, and Harrison Gray Otis, also of Massachusetts, the leading member, addressed itself to its work with prayer. It found two classes of "dangers and grievances," as it entitled them, to be considered: one which required present relief, the other which might be left for future redress. Of the first, the chief were the illegal course of the government in relation to the militia and the destitution of all defensive resources in which New England was left. To meet these difficulties, the Convention suggested that the New England States might be allowed to assume their own defence, and, further, that a reasonable portion of the taxes assessed upon them by the general government should be retained by them to cover the expenses of defending themselves. As to the second class of complaints, embracing most of the matters that had been urged against the republican administrations by the federalists, the Convention set forth seven amendments to the Constitution. These were all prohib-

tory: one against any representation of slaves; another against any embargo of longer duration than sixty days; three others against any law of non-intercourse, any war, unless it were defensive, any admission of a new state, except by a two thirds vote in Congress; a sixth against the eligibility of persons "hereafter to be naturalized" to Congress or to any civil office under the United States; and a seventh against the reëlection of a president, or the election of two successive presidents from the same state. In proposing these amendments, the Convention declared "that no hostility to the Constitution is meditated." After providing for a second Convention at Boston, in case "peace should not be concluded and the defence of these states should be rejected," the Convention adjourned, having been three weeks in session, (January 5, 1815.)

Results. The results were almost null. They might be said to have been altogether so, but for a law passed by Congress without any apparent reference to the Convention, ordering that militia should "be employed in the state raising the same or in an adjoining state, and not elsewhere, except with the assent of the executive of the state so raising the same," (January.) Otherwise, nothing followed the much dreaded Convention. The commissioners appointed to apply to the general government on the part of Massachusetts, for leave to carry out the recommendations of the Convention touching the self-defence of the states, found the war at an end when they reached Washington. The constitutional amendments were rejected by the states to which they were proposed.

Nullification in Connecticut and Massachusetts Meanwhile proceedings on which far less stress has been laid than upon those of the Hartford Convention, had occurred in Connecticut and Massachusetts. The legislatures of those states passed acts in direct conflict with a recent statute of the United

States regarding the enlistment of minors. So far was this contradicted by the measures in question, that the parties engaged in enlisting minors were subjected to fine and imprisonment, (January, 1815.) It was not the first time that these states had set themselves against the Union. Both had taken ground against the embargo, Connecticut by statute and Massachusetts by her judicial tribunals. Massachusetts had more lately resisted the measures of the government, as we shall see, in relation to British prisoners. Nullification was far beyond the doctrines of the Convention. That body had declared itself in this wise: "That acts of Congress in violation of the Constitution are absolutely void is an undeniable position. It does not, however, consist with the respect and forbearance due from a confederate state towards the general government, to fly to open resistance upon every infraction of the Constitution." But passions were high, and nullification came naturally to New England.

Defence of Louisiana.

From these strifes let us return to the less serious ones of the battle field. Late in the summer preceding the Hartford Convention, a British party landed at Pensacola, whose Spanish possessors were supposed to be inclined to side against the United States. An attack, in the early autumn, upon Fort Bowyer, thirty miles from Mobile, was repelled by the small but heroic garrison under Major Lawrence, (September 15.) A month or two afterwards, General Jackson advanced against Pensacola with a force so formidable that the British withdrew, Jackson then resigning the town to the Spanish authorities, and repairing to New Orleans, against which the enemy was believed to be preparing an expedition, (November.) There he busied himself in raising his forces and providing his defences, until the British arrived upon the coast. After capturing a feeble flotilla of the Americans, they began their advance

against the capital of Louisiana, (December.) They were ten thousand and upwards; the Americans not more than half as numerous. Jackson, on learning their approach, marched directly against them, surprising them in their camp by night, and dealing them a blow from which they hardly seem to have recovered, (December 23.) They soon, however, resumed the offensive under Sir Edward Pakenham, advancing thrice against the American lines, but thrice retreating. The last action goes by the name of the battle of New Orleans. It resulted in the defeat of the enemy, with the loss of Pakenham and two thousand besides, the Americans losing less than a hundred, (January 8, 1815.) The British retired to the sea, taking Fort Bowyer, the same that had resisted an attack the autumn before, (February 12.) Louisiana had been nobly defended, and not by the energy of Jackson alone, nor by the resolution of her own people, but by the generous spirit with which the entire south-west sent its sons to her rescue.

Martial law at New Orleans.

Jackson had hesitated at nothing in defending New Orleans. Upon the approach of the British, he proclaimed martial law; he continued it after their departure. The author of a newspaper article reflecting upon the general's conduct was sent to prison to await trial for life. The United States district judge was arrested and expelled from the city for having issued a writ of habeas corpus in the prisoner's behalf; and on the district attorney's applying to the state court in behalf of the judge, he, too, was banished. On the proclamation of peace, martial law was necessarily suspended. The judge returned, and summoning the general before him, imposed a fine of one thousand dollars. The sum was paid by Jackson, but was offered to be repaid to him by a subscription, which

proved public opinion to sustain his determined course.* It was characteristic of the man and of his adherents in after years.

Reappearance of the navy.

While these events were going on by land, the sea was for a time abandoned, at least by all national vessels. Privateers continued their work of plunder and of destruction — a work which, however miserable to contemplate, doubtless had its effect in bringing the war to a close. But the navy of the nation had disappeared from the ocean. It presently reappeared in the shape of its pride and ornament, the Constitution, which, under her new commander, Stewart, got to sea from Boston, (December, 1814.) The President, Hornet, and Peacock did the same from New York, the President being immediately captured, though not without a severe combat, by the British cruisers, (January, 1815.) Her loss was avenged by the sister vessels; the Constitution taking two sloops of war at once — the Cyane and the Levant — off Madeira, (February 20;) the Hornet sloop taking the Penguin brig off the Island of Tristan d'Acunha, (March 23;) and the Peacock sloop taking the Nautilus, an East India Company's cruiser, off Sumatra, (June 30.)† All these actions were subsequent to a treaty of peace.

The war had not continued a year when the administration accepted an offer of Russian mediation, and despatched

* Refusing to receive the subscription, he was reimbursed, near thirty years afterwards, by order of Congress.

† "Thus terminated at sea," says the British historian Alison, towards the close of an account by no means partial to the American side, "this memorable contest, in which the English, for the first time for a century and a half, met with equal antagonists on their own element; and in recounting which, the British historian, at a loss whether to admire most the devoted heroism of his own countrymen or the gallant bearing of their antagonists, feels almost equally warmed in narrating either side of the strife."

Peace preliminaries. envoys to treat of peace. The chief points to be provided for, according to the instructions, were, first, impressments, of which, it will be remembered, the settlement had been facilitated by an American law prohibiting the enlistment of British seamen in the service of the United States, and next, the matter of blockades, the only part of the anti-neutral system which had not been abandoned by the British, (March, 1813.) Great Britain declined the mediation of Russia, but offered to enter into negotiations either at London or at Gottenburg. The American government chose the latter place, and appointed five commissioners — John Quincy Adams, James A. Bayard, Henry Clay, Jonathan Russell, and Albert Gallatin — to negotiate a treaty, under much the same instructions as before, (January, February, 1814.) But on the news of the triumph of Great Britain and her allies over Napoleon, the demands of the United States were sensibly modified. The opposition alleged it to be from fear of the foe, whose power was so much increased by the issue of the European war. But the administration and its party declared that the pacification of Europe did away with the very abuses of which America had to complain; in other words, that there would be no blockades or impressments in time of peace. At all events, the envoys were directed to leave these points for future negotiation, confining themselves at present to the conclusion of a general treaty. They were also authorized to treat at London, if they thought the arrival of British commissioners at Gottenburg was likely to be delayed, (June.) The new instructions found the commissioners of both nations in session at Ghent, (August 8.)

Treaty of Ghent. Four months and a half elapsed before coming to terms. The British demands, especially on the point of retaining the conquests made during the war, were

altogether inadmissible. Fortunately, they were yielded; the disposal of the American question being desirable in the uncertain state of European affairs. A treaty was consequently framed, restoring the conquests on either side, and providing commissioners to arrange the boundary and other minor questions between the nations, (December 24.) The objects of the war, according to the declarations at its outbreak, were not mentioned in the articles by which it was closed; yet the United States did not hesitate to ratify the treaty, (February 18.) Within a week afterwards, the president recommended "the navigation of American vessels exclusively by American seamen, either natives or such as are already naturalized;" the reason assigned being "to guard against incidents which, during the periods of war in Europe, might tend to interrupt peace." What could not be gained by treaty might be secured by legislation.

Protection of foreigners.

Though much was waived for the sake of peace, one principle, if no more, had been maintained for our country. In the first year of the war, the British had set out to treat some Irishmen taken while fighting on the American side, not as ordinary prisoners of war, but as traitors to Great Britain. On their being sent to be tried for treason in England, Congress aroused itself in their behalf, and authorized the adoption of retaliatory measures. An equal number of British captives was presently imprisoned, and when the British retorted by ordering twice as many American officers into confinement, the Americans did the same by the British officers in their power. The British government went so far as to order its commanders, in case any retaliation was inflicted upon the prisoners in American hands, to destroy the towns and their inhabitants upon the coast. It was at this juncture that Massachusetts, as already alluded to, appeared in the lines of nullification. All along, there had

been very little sympathy, among the opposition, for the humane professions of defending the sailor and the stranger, upon which the administration party were apt to discourse, rather than to act. The federalist majority in Massachusetts, caring little for the fate of the Irish prisoners, forbade the use of the state prisons for the British officers now ordered to be confined, (February, 1814.) The matter was set at rest by the retraction of the British government, who consented to treat the Irishmen as prisoners of war. Proclamation was made pardoning all past offences of the sort, but threatening future ones with the penalties of treason; a threat that was never attempted to be fulfilled, (July.) So the Americans gained their point, a point for which the early settlers had labored, and for which the true men of the revolution had struggled — the protection of foreigners.

Indian treaty. Some months after the treaty of Ghent, a treaty was made with the Indians of the north-west. Such as had been at war agreed to bury the tomahawk, and to join with such as had been at peace in new relations with the United States, (September.)

Algerine treaty. Another treaty had been made by this time. It was with the Dey of Algiers, who had gone to war with the United States in the same year that Great Britain did. The United States, however, had paid no attention to the inferior enemy until relieved of the superior. Then war was declared, and a fleet despatched, under Commodore Decatur, by which captures were made, and terms dictated to the Algerine. The treaty not only surrendered all American prisoners, and indemnified all American losses in the war, but renounced the claim of tribute on the part of Algiers, (June.) Tunis and Tripoli being brought to terms, the United States were no longer tributary to pirates.

Exhaustion of the nation.

There had been strength enough to deal the blow against Algiers. But the nation was in a state of nearly complete exhaustion. This remark is not meant to apply to individual cases of embarrassment and destitution produced by the war; for while many had lost, as many more had gained a competence or a fortune. But the nation, as a whole, was, for the moment, exhausted. Madison had been reëlected president, with Elbridge Gerry as vice president, in the first year of the war with Great Britain. If he really consented to war as the price of his reëlection, he had had his reward. The difficulties of his second term, more serious than those of any other administration in our history, weighed upon him, crushed him. He welcomed peace, as his party welcomed it, — in fact, as the whole nation welcomed it, — with the same sensations of relief that men would feel in an earthquake, when the earth, yawning at their feet, suddenly closed. To see from what the government and the nation were saved, it is sufficient to read that systems of conscription for the army and of impressment for the navy were amongst the projects pending at the close of a war which had increased the public debt by one hundred and twenty millions.

CHAPTER III.

Missouri Compromise.

Foreign affairs. The idea that the United States emerged from the contest with Great Britain as a new nation, its citizens self-satisfied, and strangers applauding, is certainly a grateful one. But it is difficult to find the authority upon which it rests. To begin with foreign powers, and with the one most likely to be impressed with American grandeur — Great Britain; she appears absorbed in other interests of much larger importance in her eyes. A commercial convention was framed in the summer following the peace; but it left many matters undetermined, many unsatisfactorily determined. As for the negotiations ordered by the treaty of Ghent, they were begun upon, yet so idly, that conclusions were not reached for years and years. Other nations showed even less inclination to come to terms. France, Spain, Naples, the Netherlands, Denmark, and Sweden were all in arrears on the score of indemnities for spoliations upon American commerce; and most of them remained in arrears until a subsequent period. An act of Congress invited maritime powers to abandon the restrictions hitherto placed upon commerce; but the invitation was by no means generally accepted, (March, 1815.)

Domestic affairs. At home, affairs were in an equally unsettled state. The war establishment was lowered; a new tariff was adopted at once, to increase the revenue of the government, and to encourage the industry of the people;

the system of taxation was reformed by the gradual abolition of direct and internal taxes. To aid in restoring the currency, and in directing the finances generally, a new Bank of the United States was chartered, (March, 1816.) All this was not done in a day; nor was there any instantaneous revival of commerce and of industry. On the contrary, periods of depression recurred, in which individual fortunes vanished and national resources failed. But the general tendency was towards recovery from the disorders into which the country had been plunged by the recent war.

Administrations. Madison's troubled administration came to an end. James Monroe was the president for the next eight years, (1817–25,) with Daniel D. Tompkins as vice president. Monroe, once an extreme, but latterly a moderate republican, so far conciliated all parties as to be reëlected with but one electoral vote against him. Old parties were dying out. The great question of the period, to be set forth presently, was one with which republicans and federalists, as such, had nothing to do.

Seminole war. The new administration had but just opened, when the Seminole war, as it was styled, broke out with the Creeks of Georgia and Florida. Conflicts between the borderers and some of the Indians lingering in the territory ceded several years before, led to a determination of the United States government to clear the country of the hostile tribes, (November, 1817.) A war, of course, ensued, beginning with massacres on both sides, and ending with a spoiling, burning, slaying expedition, half militia and half Indians, under General Jackson, the conqueror of the Creeks in the preceding war, (March, 1818.) On the pretext that the Spanish authorities countenanced the hostilities of the Indians, Jackson took St. Mark's and Pensacola, not without some ideas of seizing even St. Augustine. He also put to death, within the Spanish limits, two

British subjects accused of stirring up the Indians, (March, May.) So that the war, though called the Seminole, might as well be called the Florida war. The Spanish minister protested against the invasion of the Florida territory, of which the restitution was immediately ordered at Washington, though not without approbation of the course pursued by Jackson.

Acquisition of Florida.

Florida was a sore spot on more accounts than one. The old trouble of boundaries had never been settled; but that was a trifle compared with the later troubles arising from fugitive criminals, fugitive slaves, smugglers, pirates, and, as recently shown, Indians, to whom Florida furnished not only a refuge, but a starting point. The Spanish authorities, themselves by no means inclined to respect their neighbors of the United States, had no power to make others respect them. "This country," said President Monroe, referring to Florida, "had, in fact, become the theatre of every species of lawless adventure." Matters there were not improved by the uncertain relations still continuing between the United States and Spain. Former difficulties, especially those upon American indemnities, were not settled; while new ones had gathered in consequence of South American revolutions, and North American dispositions to side with the revolutionists. The proposal of an earlier time to purchase Florida was renewed by the United States. Its acceptance was impeded chiefly by differences on the boundary between Louisiana and the Spanish Mexico, but this being settled to begin at the Sabine River, a treaty was concluded. On the payment of five millions by the American government to citizens who claimed indemnity from Spain, that power agreed to relinquish the Floridas, East and West, (February 22, 1819.) It was nearly two years, however, before Spain ratified the treaty, and fully two before Florida Territory formed a part of the United States, (1821.)

New states. The State of Connecticut, hitherto content with her charter government, at length adopted a new constitution, in which there was but little improvement upon the old one, except in making suffrage general and the support of a church system voluntary, (1818.) New constitutions and new states were constantly in process of formation. Indiana, (December 11, 1816,) Mississippi, (December 10, 1817,) Illinois, (December 3, 1818,) and Alabama,* (December 14, 1819,) all became members of the Union.

Proposal of Missouri. Before the definite accession of Alabama, Missouri was proposed as a candidate for admission. It was a slaveholding territory. But when the preliminary steps to its becoming a state were begun upon in Congress, a New York representative, James W. Tallmadge, moved that no more slaves should be brought in, and that the children of those already there should be liberated at the age of twenty-five. On the failure of this motion, another New York representative, John W. Taylor, moved to prohibit slavery in the entire territory to the north of latitude 36° 30′. This, too, was lost. A bill setting off the portion of Missouri Territory to the south of the line just named, as the Territory of Arkansas, was passed. But nothing was done towards establishing the State of Missouri, (February, March, 1819.)

Question of slavery. Nothing, unless it were the debate, in which the question at issue became clear. There were two reasons, it then appeared, for making Missouri a free state; one, that it was the turn for a free state, the last (Alabama) † having been a slave state; while, of the eight admitted since the Constitution, four had been free and four

* The eastern half of the Mississippi Territory became the Territory of Alabama in 1817.

† Not yet actually admitted, but authorized to apply for admission in the usual way.

slave states. Another and a broader reason was urged, to the effect that slavery ought not to be permitted in any state or territory where it could be prohibited. On this, the northern views were the more earnest, in that the nation had committed itself by successive acts to a course too tolerant, if not too favorable, towards slavery. First, it will be recollected, came the organization of the Territory South of the Ohio; next, that of the Mississippi Territory; and afterwards, the acquisition and the organization of Louisiana. All these proceedings were national, and all either acknowledged or extended the area of slavery. Kentucky had been admitted a slave state as a part of Virginia; Mississippi and Alabama as parts of the Mississippi Territory. To carry out the same course would have insured the admission of Missouri as a part of the Louisiana acquisition; and on this the southern members strongly insisted. To this, on the contrary, the north demurred, determined, if possible, to stop the movement that had thus far prevailed.

Constitutional argument.

A good deal of discussion arose on the point of the treaty by which Louisiana had been acquired. This, argued one party, by investing the inhabitants of the Louisiana Territory with all the rights of United States citizens, secures their privileges as slaveholders; a position, of course, opposed by northern men. But much greater stress was laid on the constitutional argument hinted at in a former connection. The proposal to oblige Missouri to become a free state, said the advocates of slavery, is a violation of the Constitution. That sovereign authority, they declared, leaves the state itself in all cases to settle the matter of slavery, as well as all other matters not expressly subjected to the general government. To this a twofold answer was returned: first, that Missouri was not a state, but a territory, and therefore subject to the control of Congress; and, second, that even if regarded as a

state, she would not be one of the original thirteen, to which alone belonged the powers reserved under the Constitution. Therefore Congress could deal with her as it pleased. It was moreover argued that Congress ought to arrest the progress of slavery, as a point upon which the national welfare was staked; a point, therefore, to which the authority of the general government was expressly and indispensably applicable according to the Constitution.

Two sides.

Arguments so divergent, and principles so opposite, as those which have been sketched, show that there were two sides in the controversy. Other considerations were urged. One in particular was brought forward by the slave state party, that the slaves, as well as the freemen of the nation, were entitled to profit by its increase; in short, that humanity required the extension of slavery. Equally extreme opinions were preferred on the opposing side. In thus stating the various turns given to the question, we have gone somewhat beyond the limits of the original debate. It was not till a later time that many of the positions were so decisively taken as has been described. But the points involved in them were clear from the beginning.

Intense agitation.

Had it been an outbreak of hostilities, had it been a march of one half the country against the other, there could hardly have been a more intense agitation. The attempted prohibition of slavery was denounced in Congress as the preliminary to a negro massacre, to a civil war, to a dissolution of the Union. Out of Congress, it provoked such language as that used by the aged Jefferson: "The Missouri question," he wrote, "is a breaker on which we lose the Missouri country by revolt, and what more God only knows. From the battle of Bunker's Hill to the treaty of Paris, we never had so ominous a question." Public meetings were held; those at the south to repel the

interference of the north, those at the north to rebuke the pretensions of the south. The arguments of Congress, repeated again and again, kept up the ferment. It was not the mere agitator, however, whether politician or philanthropist, who took the lead; grave men, men of years and of honors, entered into the lists on both sides. The dispute extended into the tribunals and the legislatures of the states, the northern declaring that Missouri must be for freemen only, the southern that it must be for freemen and for slaves.

Maine seeks admission.

So stood the matter as the year drew to a close and Congress reassembled. A new turn was then given to the question, by the application of Maine to be received as a state, Massachusetts having consented to the separation. Here, then, is the free state to match with Alabama, exclaimed the partisans of slavery in Missouri: now give us our slave state. But the opponents of slavery did not yield; they had planted themselves on principles, they said, not on numbers. At this the south was naturally indignant. It had been a plea all along that a free state was due to the north; and now, when one was forthcoming, two were claimed. If the reply was made that Maine, being but a division of Massachusetts, was no addition to the northern strength, this did not content the south. Feelings of bitterness and of injustice were aroused between both parties; both drew farther apart. If peace did not come, war would, and that soon.

The compromise.

The Senate united Maine and Missouri in the same bill and on the same terms, that is, without any restriction upon slavery. But a clause, introduced on the motion of Jesse B. Thomas, of Illinois, prohibited the introduction of slavery into any portion of the Louisiana Territory as yet unorganized, leaving Louisiana the state and Arkansas the territory, as well as Missouri, just what

they were, that is, slaveholding. This was the Missouri Compromise. It came from the north. On the part of the north, it yielded the claim to Missouri as a free state; on the part of the south, it yielded the claim to the immensely larger regions which stretched above and beyond Missouri to the Pacific. The line of 36° 30′, proposed the year before, was again proposed, save only that Missouri, though north of the line, was to be a Southern State. Thus the Senate determined, not without opposition from both sides. The House, on the contrary, adopted a bill admitting Missouri, separately from Maine, and under the northern restriction concerning slavery. Words continued to run high. Henry Clay, still in the House, wrote that the subject "engrosses the whole thoughts of the members, and constitutes almost the only topic of conversation." But the proposal of the Compromise augured the return of tranquillity. A committee of conference between the two branches of Congress led to the agreement of both Senate and House upon a bill admitting Missouri, after her constitution should be formed, free of restrictions, but prohibiting slavery north of the line of 36° 30′, (March 3, 1820.) Maine was admitted at the same time, (March 3–15.)

Different interpretations.

The Compromise prohibited slavery in the designated region forever. This was the letter; but it was under different interpretations. When President Monroe consulted his cabinet upon the question of approving the act of Congress, all but his secretary of state, John Quincy Adams, inclined to read the prohibition of slavery as applying only to the territories, and not to the states that might arise within the prescribed boundaries. This was not a difference between northern and southern views, but one between strict and liberal constructions of the Constitution; the strict construction going against all power in Congress to restrict a state, while the liberal took

the opposite ground. So with others besides the cabinet. Amongst the very men who voted for the Compromise were many, doubtless, who understood it as applying to territories alone. The northern party, unquestionably, adopted it in its broader sense, preventing the state as well as the territory from establishing slavery. That there should be two senses attached to it from the beginning was a dark presage of future differences.

Admission of Missouri.

Present differences were not yet overcome. Missouri, rejoicing in becoming a slaveholding state, adopted a constitution which denied even free negroes the rights of citizens. On this being brought before Congress towards the close of the year, (1820,) various tactics were adopted; the extreme southern party going for the immediate admission of the state, while the extreme northern side urged the overthrow of state, constitution, and Compromise, together. Henry Clay, at the head of the moderate men, succeeded, after long exertions, in carrying a measure providing for the admission of Missouri as soon as her legislature should solemnly covenant the rights of citizenship to "the citizens of either of the states," (February, 1821.) This was done, and Missouri became a state, (August 10.)

Slave trade.

The United States, as a nation, were far from insensible to the evils of slavery. Domestic slave trade was permitted and extended. But foreign slave trade, reviving to such a degree that upwards of fourteen thousand slaves were said to have been imported in a single year, (1818,) provoked general indignation. An act of Congress declared fresh and severer penalties to attach to the slave dealer, while to his unhappy victims relief was offered in provisions for their return to their native country, (1819.) Another act denounced the traffic as piracy, (1820.) The same denunciation was urged upon foreign governments,

one of which, Great Britain, prepared to enter into a convention for the purpose; but the convention fell through, (1823–24.)

Visit of Lafayette.

In the midst of its dissensions and its weaknesses, the nation was cheered by a visit from Lafayette. He came in compliance with a summons from the government to behold the work which he had assisted in beginning, near half a century before. From the day of his landing (August 16, 1824) to that of his departure, (September 7, 1825,) a period of more than a year, he was, as he described himself, "in a whirlwind of popular kindnesses of which it was impossible to have formed any previous conception, and in which every thing that could touch and flatter one was mingled." "A more interesting spectacle, it is believed," said President Monroe, "was never witnessed, because none could be founded on purer principles, none proceed from higher or more disinterested motives." To make some amends for his early sacrifices, pecuniary as well as personal, in the American cause, Congress voted Lafayette a township of the public domain, and a grant of two hundred thousand dollars. He deserved all that could be bestowed.

CHAPTER IV.

The Monroe Doctrine.

Relations with Central and South America.

It was time for the nation to assume a more elevated attitude. No longer the solitary republic amidst encompassing domains of distant monarchies, the United States now formed one of a band of independent states, stretching from Canada to Patagonia. The others were the Central and South American colonies of Spain, which had spent years in insurrection and in war, before their independence was recognized by their elder sister of the north, (1822.) Ministers plenipotentiary were at the same time appointed to Mexico, Colombia, Buenos Ayres, and Chili.

Monroe doctrine.

As if to make amends for its delay, the administration resolved upon stretching out an arm of defence between the nascent states of the south and the threatening powers of Europe. The purpose of the European allies, France, Austria, Prussia, and Russia, to come to the assistance of Spain, in subduing her insurgent colonies, was well known, when President Monroe, in his seventh annual message, (December 2, 1823,) announced that his administration had asserted in negotiations with Russia, "as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent position which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European pow-

ers." "We owe it," continued the president, "to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence, and maintained it, and whose independence we have on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States." Such was what has since been called the Monroe Doctrine, though the author is known to have been the secretary of state, John Quincy Adams, rather than the president.

Purpose.

Its purpose was evidently twofold, directed generally against any interference with the American continents on the part of Europe, except where Europe already possessed a foothold, and more particularly against the interference with which Europe, or a portion of it, was then menacing the republics of Central and Southern America. But far from its being intended to make the United States themselves the guardians or the rulers of America, the doctrine, as expounded by its real author, Adams, proposed "that each [American state] will guard by its own means against the establishment of any future European colony within its borders." The declaration of the president was designed simply to show that the nation undertook to countenance and to support the independence of its sister nations. As such, it was an honorable deed. "The tone which it uttered," said Daniel Webster, in the

House of Representatives, two years afterwards, "found a corresponding response in the breasts of the free people of the United States." Congress, however, declined to sustain it by any formal action.

Congress of Panama.

Some time afterwards, when the author of the Monroe Doctrine had risen to the presidency, an invitation was received by the government from some of the Central and South American states to unite in a congress at Panama. The objects, ranging from mere commercial negotiations up to the Monroe Doctrine, were rather indefinite; but Adams appointed two envoys, whom the Senate confirmed, and for whom the House made the necessary appropriations, though not without great opposition, (December, 1825 — March, 1826.) One of the envoys died, the other did not go upon his mission; so that the congress began and ended without any representation from the United States, (June — July.) It adjourned to meet at Tacubaya, near Mexico, in the beginning of the following year. The ministers of the United States repaired to the appointed place, and at the appointed time, but there was no congress.

An American league.

Thus terminated the vision of an American league. We can hardly estimate the consequences of its having been realized — on one side, the perils to which the United States would have been exposed, and on the other, the services which they might have rendered, amongst such confederates as those of Central and of South America.

CHAPTER V.

Tariff Compromise.

Administrations.

John Quincy Adams, the son of the second president, was elected by the House of Representatives — the electoral colleges failing to make a choice — to succeed Monroe, (1825.) Andrew Jackson, a rival candidate, was chosen by the people at the next election, (1829.) John C. Calhoun was vice president under both. Two men more unlike than Adams and Jackson, in associations and in principles, could hardly have been found amongst the politicians of the period. They resembled each other, however, in the resolution with which they met the dangers of their times.

Question before the country.

The great question before the country for several years was one as old as the Constitution; older, even, inasmuch as it occupied a chief place in the debates of the Constitutional Convention. It was the subordination of the state to the nation.

Georgia controversy.

The first occasion to revive the question, and to invest it with fresh importance, was a controversy between the national government and the government of Georgia. Many years had passed since that state consented to cede her western lands, including the present Alabama and Mississippi, on condition that the government would extinguish the Indian title to the territory of Georgia itself. Of twenty-five millions of acres then held by the Creek nation, fifteen had been bought up by the United

States, and transferred to Georgia. Half of the remaining ten millions belonged to the Cherokees, and half to the Creeks, a nominal treaty with the latter of whom declared the United States possessors of all the Creek territory within the limits both of Georgia and of Alabama, (1825.) This treaty, however, agreed to by but one or two of the chiefs, provoked a general outbreak on the part of the Creeks. To pacify them, or rather to do common justice to them, the government first suspended the treaty, and then entered into a new one, by which the cession of land was confined to the Georgian territory. A longer time was also allowed for the removal of the Indians from the ceded country, (April, 1826.) What satisfied the Creeks dissatisfied the Georgians or their authorities. Governor Troup accused the administration of violating the law of the land, in the shape of the earlier treaty, hinting at anti-slavery motives for the course that had been taken, and calling upon the adjoining states to "stand by their arms." Not confining himself to protests or defensive measures, Troup sent surveyors into the Indian territory. President Adams communicated the matter to Congress, asserting his intention "to enforce the laws, and fulfil the duties of the nation by all the force committed for that purpose to his charge." Whereat the governor wrote to the secretary of war, "From the first decisive act of hostility, you will be considered and treated as a public enemy," (1827.) Fortunately, the winds ceased. The state that had set itself against the nation more decidedly than had ever yet been done returned to its senses. As for the unhappy Indians, not only the Creeks, but all the other tribes that could be persuaded to move, were gradually transported to more distant territories in the west.

Tariffs.

Other causes were operating to excite the states, or some of them, against the general government.

Amidst the vicissitudes of industry and of trade through which the nation was passing, repeated attempts were made to steady affairs by a series of tariffs in favor of domestic productions. The first measure, intended to serve for protection rather than for revenue, was adopted at the beginning of the period embraced in a previous chapter, (1816.) It was a duty, principally, upon cotton fabrics from abroad. Some years afterwards, a new scale was framed, with provision against foreign woollens, as well as cottons, (1824.) This not turning out as advantageous to the home manufactures as was anticipated, an effort for additional protection was made; but at first in vain. On one side were the manufacturers, not merely of cotton and of woollen goods, but of iron, hemp, and a variety of other materials, clustered in the Northern and Central States. On the other were the merchants, the farmers, and the artisans of the same states, with almost the entire population of the agricultural south. A convention of the manufacturing interests, attended by delegates from New England, the Middle States, Maryland, Virginia, Ohio, and Kentucky, was held at Harrisburg, in Pennsylvania. "We want protection," was the language used by the delegates, "and it matters not if it amounts to prohibition;" in which spirit they pressed what they called the American System upon the federal government, (July — August, 1827.) The administration, by the report of the secretary of the treasury, commended the subject to the favorable attention of Congress. That body took it up, and after protracted discussions, consented to a tariff in which the system of protection was carried to its height. Its adversaries called the bill a bill of abominations, many of which, however, were introduced by themselves, with the avowed intention of making the measure as odious and as short lived as possible, (December, 1827 — May, 1828.)

Nullification at the south.

All the interests of the north were by no means consulted by the recent tariff. Meetings had been held to prevent its passage; nor was it received, when passed, without murmurs and remonstrances. But it was in the south that the flames burst forth most violently. State rights, the relations of master and slave, — as well as the cotton market, — principles and interests of every sort were declared to be threatened. While the tariff was in abeyance, South Carolina instructed her representatives to oppose the bill, taking care that "the state should appear as a sovereign, not as a suppliant." After the bill became a law, South Carolina pronounced it unconstitutional; so did Georgia; so did Virginia; in fact, it was a trial among the states which should precipitate itself the deepest into nullification. The administration stood firm. "To the voice of just complaint," the president had said, "from any portion of their constituents, the representatives of the states and people will never turn away their ears. But so long as the duty of the foreign shall operate only as a bounty upon the domestic article, the planter, and the merchant, and the shepherd, and the husbandman will not denounce, as violations of the Constitution, the deliberate acts of Congress to shield the native industry of the Union."

Removals from office.

Jackson came into office to devote himself at first to those who had elected him. Never before had the nation been under so professedly a party rule. Its subjection was proved by the removals from office of such as had served under the previous administrations. In all the forty years that had elapsed since the opening of the government, the successive presidents had removed just sixty-four public officers, and no more. Jackson turned out the servants of government by the hundred. This imprinting a partisan character upon the administration was far

from being unacceptable to the majority of the nation. It was but just, they argued, that the inferior officers should be of the same views as the superior; otherwise there could be no harmony. A great deal of stress, moreover, was laid upon the necessity of reforming the administration; the alleged extravagance of Adams's time having been sounded all over the land by the partisans of Jackson. The clamor of the opposition against either cause of removal can be conceived.

Concessions to Georgia.

The great question between the power of the state and the power of the nation was still open. Jackson entered into it with concessions to the state. When the Creeks of Georgia were disposed of, there still remained the Cherokees of the same and the neighboring states. This tribe, far from being inclined to leave its habitations, was so much inclined to settling where it was, as to adopt a formal constitution, (1827.) At this, Georgia lost patience, and asserted her jurisdiction over the Cherokees, at the same time dividing their territory, and annexing it in portions to the counties of the state, (1828–30.) Much the same course was taken by Alabama and Mississippi in relation to the Indians within their borders, (1829–30.) In these circumstances, the position of the general government was this — that it had always undertaken to treat with the Indians, to protect or to molest them, as the case might be; but in no event leaving them to the action of any separate part of the nation. Instead of maintaining this position in relation to the southern Indians, the president, supported by Congress, yielded it altogether, upon the ground that the Cherokee constitution was the erection of a new state within the limits of Georgia and Alabama. It would have been well had Georgia contented herself with the Indians thus surrendered to her. But she must needs interfere with the whites, the very missionaries

of the Indian territory, and imprison them in her penitentiary for not taking the oath of allegiance which she demanded, (1831.) Their case was carried before the United States Supreme Court, which decided against the course of Georgia with regard to both missionaries and Indians, (1832.) But the Indians obtained no redress; nor did the missionaries, until they abandoned their proceedings against the sovereign state, (1833.)

Tariff questions.

More serious points in relation to the question between the states and the general government had arisen. The first message of President Jackson (December, 1829) suggested a modification of the tariff adopted the year before. It was another concession, on his part, to the state claims. But it was not made without cause. The system of protection, once opposed and favored by the north and by the south together, had come to be a favorite of the north, and an object of opposition to the south. Emigration from the older to the newer states, followed by a depreciation in the value of the lands long settled, had greatly affected southern interests, much more so than the tariff, to which every reverse was apt to be ascribed. But the apparent cause was just as effectual in kindling excitement as if it had been the real one. The south and the north were set against each other; it was a fresh strife of sections, full of peril to the nation. President Jackson adverted to it in recommending a consideration of the tariff. At once the questions of the former administration revived. But the result for the present, so far as the tariff was concerned, consisted in a few unimportant modifications, (May, 1830.)

Foot's resolution: Debate.

At the same time, a resolution before the Senate was indefinitely postponed, after having elicited a remarkable debate upon the points at issue before the country. It had been brought forward by Sen-

ator Foot, of Connecticut, just at the close of the previous year, (December 29, 1829,) with a view to some arrangement concerning the sale of the public lands. But the public lands were soon lost sight of in a discussion involving the relative powers of the states and the national government. Robert Y. Hayne, a senator from South Carolina, took the ground that a state possessed the right of nullifying any act of Congress which it should consider unconstitutional, inasmuch as the government, whereof Congress was a part, resulted from a compact amongst the states. The opposite theory, that the government was established by the people of the United States as a whole, and not by the states as separate members, was taken chiefly by Daniel Webster, some years before a representative of his native New Hampshire, at present a senator from his adopted Massachusetts. The great speech of Webster (January 26–27, 1830) was, without contradiction, the ablest plea that had ever been made for the national character, as well as the national government. It decided the fact, so far as argument in the Senate chamber could do, that the general government, in its proper functions, is independent of all local institutions. As a necessary consequence, the claim of a state to nullify an act of Congress fell to the ground. The same doctrine was advocated by Madison, first amongst the survivors of those who had framed the Constitution, (August.) "I trust," said Webster, near the beginning of the following year, "the crisis has in some measure passed by." It was not the last time, however, that he had to raise his powerful voice in the defence of the Constitution.

Revision of tariff.

A year or more elapsed before the subject of the tariff was called up again. It was then decided by Congress and the president to revise the provisions against which the south was still contending. Without abandoning the protective system, which, on the contrary, was distinctly

maintained, the duties upon many of the protected articles were reduced, in order to satisfy the opponents of protection, (July, 1832.)

Nullification in South Carolina.

Far from diverting the storm, the action upon the tariff did but hasten its approach. The South Carolina members of Congress addressed their constituents in this wise: "After expressing their solemn and deliberate conviction that the protecting system must now be regarded as the settled policy of the country, and that all hope of relief from Congress is irrecoverably gone, they leave it with you, the sovereign power of the state, to determine whether the rights and liberties which you received as a precious inheritance from an illustrious ancestry shall be tamely surrendered without a struggle, or transmitted undiminished to your posterity." The tempest that ensued was prodigious, considering the limited sphere through which it had to sweep. The legislature of South Carolina summoned a convention of the state, which met at Columbia, under the presidency of Governor Hamilton, (November 19.) A few days sufficed to pass an ordinance declaring "that the several acts, and parts of acts, purporting to be laws for the imposing of duties on importation . . . are unauthorized by the Constitution of the United States, and violate the true intent and meaning thereof, and are null and void, and no law, nor binding upon the State of South Carolina, its officers and citizens; . . . and that it shall be the duty of the legislature to adopt such measures and pass such acts as may be necessary to give full effect to this ordinance, and to prevent the enforcement and arrest the operation of the said acts, and parts of acts, of the Congress of the United States within the limits of the state," (November 24.)

Secession.

In all this there was nothing new to the nation. From the time when Kentucky and Virginia began

upon a similar course, from the time when Massachusetts and Connecticut continued it, down to the more recent acts of Georgia and of South Carolina herself, nullification, in nominal if not in actual existence, had stalked throughout the land. A state that felt itself aggrieved by the general government was very apt to take to resolutions, often to positive statutes, against the laws or the measures of the Union. But South Carolina went further than any of her predecessors. "We, the people of South Carolina," concluded the ordinance of the convention, "do further declare that we will not submit to the application of force, on the part of the federal government, to reduce this state to obedience, but that we will consider the passage by Congress of any act . . . to enforce the acts hereby declared to be null and void, otherwise than through the civil tribunals of the country, as inconsistent with the longer continuance of South Carolina in the Union; and that the people of this state . . . will forthwith proceed to organize a separate government." This was something more than nullification; it was secession.

Resolution of South Carolina.

It has been very common to exclaim against the conduct of South Carolina. But with the principles which she professed, supporting the claims of the state to be a sovereign member of a national confederacy, it is difficult to see how she could have acted otherwise. If we would censure any thing, it must be the principles which led to nullification and to secession, rather than these, the mere and the inevitable results. In itself, as an instance of resolution against what was deemed injustice and oppression, the attitude of South Carolina is no object of indignation. On the contrary, there is something thrilling in the aspect of a people perilling their all to sustain their rights, even though they were mistaken as to what their rights really were "The die has been at last cast," the governor

informed the legislature, assembled a day or two after the adoption of the ordinance by the convention, "and South Carolina has at length appealed to her ulterior sovereignty as a member of this confederacy. . . . That it brings up a juncture of deep and momentous interest, is neither to be concealed nor denied." The legislature unhesitatingly responded to the convention in a series of acts prohibiting the collection of duties, and providing for the employment of volunteers, or, if need were, of the entire militia, in the defence of the state.

Resolution of government.

If the state was resolute, the general government was no less so. The president was in his element. A crisis which he was eminently adapted to meet had arrived. It called forth all his independence, all his nationality. Other men — more than one of his predecessors — would have doubted the course to be pursued; they would have staid to inquire into the powers of the Constitution, or to count the resources of the government; nay, had they been consistent, they would have inclined to the support, rather than to the overthrow, of the South Carolina doctrine. Jackson did not waver an instant. He took his own counsel, as he was wont to do, and declared for the nation against the state; then ordered troops and a national vessel to the support of the government officers in South Carolina. "No act of violent opposition to the laws has yet been committed," — thus the president declared in a proclamation; "but such a state of things is hourly apprehended; and it is the intent of this instrument to proclaim not only that the duty imposed on me by the Constitution, to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, shall be performed, . . . but to warn the citizens of South Carolina . . . that the course they are urged to pursue is one of ruin and disgrace to the very state whose right they affect to support," (December.) The appeal to the South

Carolinians was the more forcible in coming from one of themselves, as it were; Jackson being a native of their state. Addressing Congress in an elaborate message, (January 16, 1833,) the president argued down both nullification and secession, maintaining that "the result of each is the same; since a state in which, by a usurpation of power, the constitutional authority of the federal government is openly defied and set aside, wants only the form to be independent of the Union." He then proceeded to recount the measures which he had taken, and to propose those which he considered it necessary for Congress to take. Congress responded, after some delay, by an enforcing act, the primary object of which was to secure the collection of the customs in the South Carolina ports. Thus united stood the government in sustaining itself against the state by which it was defied.

Resolution of states.

Nor did it stand alone. One after another, the states, by legislative or by individual proceedings, came out in support of the national principle. The principle of state sovereignty, that might have found support but for the extremity to which it had been pushed, seemed to be abandoned. South Carolina was left to herself, even by her neighbors, usually prone to take the same side. Only Virginia came forward, appealing to the government as well as to South Carolina to be done with strife. As if to show her sympathy for the cause of the state, Virginia appointed a commissioner to convey her sentiments to the people of South Carolina. Otherwise the states ranged themselves distinctly, though not all actively, on the side of the nation.

Tariff compromise.

But on one point there was a decided reservation with many of the states. The tariff was openly condemned by North Carolina, Alabama, and Georgia; the last state proposing a southern convention, to

take some measures of resistance to the continuance of a system so unconstitutional. It became plainer and plainer, that if South Carolina was to be brought to terms by any other way than by force, or if her sister states of the south were to be kept from joining her sooner or later, it must be by some modification of the tariff. A bill was brought forward in the House, but without any immediate result. Henry Clay took the matter up in the Senate. He had distinguished himself as the advocate of the Missouri Compromise. He was the author, in consultation with others, of the tariff compromise. This proposed that the duties on all imports exceeding twenty per cent. should be reduced to that rate by successive diminutions through the next ten years, (till June 30, 1842.) "I wish," said Clay, "to see the tariff separated from the politics of the country, that business men may go to work in security, with some prospect of stability in our laws." Had there been no other motive for his course, this would have been enough to stamp it with wisdom. Others felt as he did. Unlike the Missouri question, the tariff question was disposed of without protracted struggles. The advocates of protection wrangled against the compromise, as a matter of course; but the measure was supported by very general approval, not excepting the representatives of South Carolina, at the head of whom was Calhoun, lately surrendering the vice presidency in order to represent his state in the Senate. In fact, the impossibility of restoring peace by any other means was palpable. The compromise became a law, (March 2,) and South Carolina returned to her allegiance. "The lightning," as one of Clay's correspondents wrote to him, was "drawn out from the clouds which were lowering over the country."

Decision.

Like all other compromises, the tariff compromise did not bring about an absolute decision of the

points of controversy. To the opponents of protection it abated the amount of protection. To the champions of the protective system it secured the right of laying duties, but at the same time decided against the expediency, if not the right, of excessive duties. In other words, perhaps it may be said that the compromise gave up prohibition, but retained protection. It was not enough to settle the question in detail; yet it was enough to settle the question on broad principles.

On the great question.

As for the subject that lay behind the tariff, not concealed, but overtopping it by an immensity of height, this, too, was decided in the same general way. The subordination of the state to the nation was not defined. But it was established on principles which no nullification could disturb, and no secession break asunder, except in national ruin.

CHAPTER VI.

Financial Disorders.

National finance.

Few matters are more important to a nation — especially to a money-making nation — than its finance. This being in a sound condition, the course of government and of the people is so far smoothed and secured. But if it is disturbed, either by those in authority or by those engaged in speculations of their own, the whole country suffers. Time and again had these things been proved in the United States; a fresh and a fearful proof was soon to occur.

Veto of United States Bank charter.

The administration of Jackson had but just begun, (1829,) when an attempt was made to interfere with the appointments in the United States Bank. The resistance of the bank is supposed to have excited the displeasure of the president, who, at all events, took occasion in his first message to throw out suggestions against the renewal of the bank charter, although this was not to expire for six or seven years to come. Congress, instead of complying with the presidential recommendation, showed a decided determination to sustain the bank. The next Congress voted to renew the charter, but the president immediately interposed with a veto, (July, 1832.) Amidst many sound objections on his part was mingled much that must be set down as prejudice, not to say extravagance; he even went so far as to suppose the bank to be dangerous "to our liberty and independence."

Removal of deposits.

Not content with opposing the rechartering of the bank, the president determined to humble it before its charter expired. To this, it must be confessed, he was in some degree goaded by the unsparing bitterness with which his veto had been assailed. On the other hand, the triumphant reëlection of Jackson to the presidency, with his right hand man, Martin Van Buren, for vice president, assured him of a support which would not fail him in any measures he might pursue. In his next message, (December, 1832,) he recommended the removal of the treasury deposits from the custody of the bank, but without obtaining the coöperation of Congress. Things went on as they were until the early autumn of the following year, when (September, 1833) the president announced to his cabinet his resolution to remove the deposits on his own responsibility, assigning for his principal reasons the electioneering procedures against his administration, of which the bank was suspected, and the necessity of providing for some new method of managing the public revenue before the expiration of the charter incapacitated the bank from serving as it had hitherto done. The terms of the charter provided that the power of recalling the deposits lay with the secretary of the treasury, subject to the condition of acquainting Congress with the proceeding — a condition which the party of the bank interpreted as subjecting the question of removal to the approval or disapproval of the legislature. The administration and its supporters, on the other hand, contended that the power of the secretary in the matter did not depend upon the will of Congress, but rested with himself, of course under the directions of the president. This, however, did not smooth the way; for the secretary then in office, William J. Duane, declined to have any thing to do with the removal. Two days afterwards, he was displaced to make room for Roger B. Taney,

then attorney general, and subsequently chief justice of the United States. The new secretary, not sharing the scruples of his predecessor, issued the proper order for the removal of the deposits at the time indicated by the president, (October 1.)

Agitation. Of the agitation attending these events it is difficult to conceive at this distance of time. If we account for the suspicions of the president against the bank, there still remain the accusations from the bank and from its friends against the president to be explained. Had Jackson declared himself the lord and master of the United States, there could scarcely have been a greater uproar. It vented itself in meetings and in legislative bodies, as usual. It broke forth in Congress, especially in the Senate, where, at the instigation of Henry Clay, the recent competitor of Jackson for the presidency, a resolve was adopted, "That the president, in the late executive proceeding in relation to the public revenue, has assumed upon himself authority and power not conferred by the Constitution and laws, but in derogation of both," (March, 1834.) The same day Daniel Webster remarked, "If this experiment of the executive government is suffered to go on, it will bring us to consequences nearly touching the powers and continued action of this government. . . . Let all who mean to die as they live, citizens of a free country, stand together for the supremacy of the laws." Against the sentence of the Senate, passed upon him without a hearing, the president issued a protest, as a "substitute for that defence which," said he, "I have not been allowed to present in the ordinary form," (April.) So one extreme led to another, until, near three years later, it was made a party measure to expunge from the records of the Senate the resolution of censure, (January, 1837.)

As for the bank itself, it "waged war," said the president

Money troubles. afterwards, "upon the people, in order to compel them to submit to its demands." It certainly appeared to do so; but the course taken by it was quite as much a defensive as an offensive one. The loss of the deposits involved a contraction of loans. These contractions affected other banks, which were obliged to curtail their own operations, until credit sank, capitalists failed, and laborers ceased to be employed. All this increased the excitement, at first depending upon party statements and constitutional theories. The sufferers turned against both sides; a part against the bank, which was represented as a monstrous despotism, a part against the president, who was represented as an equally monstrous despot. We seem to read of a nation gone wild, in reading of these things as they are told by their contemporaries.

Surplus revenue. While individuals were suffering, the government was in a state of repletion. Not only was the public debt entirely paid off, (1835,) but a large balance was left in the banks to which the public moneys had been transferred from the United States Bank. It was resolved by the administration to deposit, as the phrase went, all but a reserve of five millions with the states, to be used according to their different circumstances, (1836.) A sum of twenty-eight millions was thus distributed, the states generally understanding that the share which each received was its own, not merely to be employed, but to be retained, (1837.) Nothing was ever recalled by the government, great as its embarrassments soon became.

Abolitionism. Into the old fissure between the north and the south a new wedge was driven during the present period. This was abolitionism, so called from its demands that slavery should be immediately abolished in the District of Columbia and the national territories, by Congress, and

in the slaveholding states by the state governments, or the slaveholders themselves. To effect their purposes, the abolitionists, all northerners, organized themselves in associations, local and general, into which persons of both sexes and of every age were gathered, while addresses and publications of various sorts were spread in all directions, north and south, (1831–5.) Whatever their motives, the champions of abolition often pursued a vituperative and exasperating course, rousing the north as well as the south, and accounting for, though never excusing, the violent and even sanguinary proceedings of their opponents, who broke open the southern post offices, in search of anti-slavery papers, and attacked the gathering and the printing places of the abolitionists in the north, (1834–5.) The president took the ground that the transmission of abolition documents to the south was calculated to stir up a servile war; and so imbittered did Congress become, as to refuse to receive memorials upon the subject of slavery, a subject often before provocative of angry passages, but never until now considered too delicate to be approached, (1836.) The cause of emancipation was thrown back still farther by the hostility excited against it, as well as against its advocates, throughout the Southern States. Abolitionism had resulted in conservatism, and that of a stamp as yet unknown to the most conservative.

Indian wars.

Relations with the Indians were frequently disturbed. The process of removing them to the west of the Mississippi continued a cause of disorder and of strife. A war with the Sacs and Foxes, under Black Hawk, broke out on the north-west frontier, but was soon brought to an end by a vigorous campaign on the part of the United States troops and the militia, under Generals

Scott and Atkinson, (1832.) Another war arose with the Seminoles, under their chief Osceola, in Florida. It was attended by serious losses from the beginning, (1835.) On the junction of the Creeks with the Seminoles, affairs grew still worse, the war extending into Georgia and Alabama, (1836.) The Creeks were subdued under the directions of General Jessup; but the Seminoles continued in arms amidst the thickets of Florida for many years.

Disturbed foreign relations.

Occasional disturbances occurred in foreign relations, especially respecting the indemnities still due on account of spoliations of American commerce. These were gradually arranged; Denmark (1830) and Naples (1834) meeting the claims of long standing against them; the more recent demands against Portugal and Spain being also satisfied, though not by immediate payments, (1832, 1834.)

Especially with France.

The relations with France were more precarious. After twenty or thirty years' unavailing negotiation with the governments of Napoleon and his Bourbon successors, a treaty was concluded with the government of Louis Philippe, acknowledging the American claims to the amount of about five million dollars, (July, 1831.) Three years afterwards, the French Chambers rejected the bill for the execution of the treaty, (1834.) Meantime the United States government had drawn a draft for the amount of the first instalment proposed to be paid by France, but only to have the draft protested. Thus doubly aggrieved, the administration proposed to Congress the authorization of reprisals upon French property, in case immediate provision for the fulfilment of the treaty should not be made by the French Chambers, (December, 1834.) The mere proposal, though unsupported by any action of Congress, was received as an affront in France; the French minister at Washing-

ton being recalled, and the American minister at Paris being tendered his passports. The Chambers, however, voted the appropriations required by the treaty, subject to the condition that the president's proposals to Congress should be satisfactorily explained, (1835.) "Does France," asked the president, in a special message on the subject, (January, 1836,) "desire only a declaration that we had no intention to obtain our rights by an address to her fears rather than her justice? She has already had it. . . . Does France want a degrading, servile repetition, in terms which she shall dictate, and which will involve an acknowledgment of her assumed right to interfere in our domestic councils? She will never obtain it." The alternative suggested to Congress was "prohibiting the introduction of French products and the entry of French vessels," or "the interdiction of all commercial intercourse." At this crisis Great Britain offered her mediation. It was accepted; but, without waiting for its exercise, the French government resolved to execute the treaty. The news soon came that the five millions were paid, (May, 1836.)

Parties. The nation was united in supporting the administration against France and the stranger generally. But on the score of domestic relations there were wide divisions. Party spirit, dying out under Monroe, and afterwards reviving with respect to men rather than to principles, was soon excited concerning both. Jackson had drawn around him the most devoted adherents, devoted at once to him and to his system. On the other hand, the character of the administration and of its chief were most earnestly opposed by a party formed of those who had once followed after the president, as well as of those who had always been in opposition. This, after various changes of name, became the whig party; the supporters of the administration forming the democratic party.

Commercial crisis. The financial disorders of the time came to a head directly after Martin Van Buren succeeded his chief in the presidency, (March, 1837,) when the banks, first of New York, and then of other cities, suspended specie payments, (May.) A committee from New York, appointed to urge the president to suspend the requirement of payments in specie to the treasury, and to call an extra session of Congress, stated in their address "that the value of their real estate [in New York alone] had, within the last six months, depreciated more than forty millions of dollars; that within the preceding two months there had been more than two hundred and fifty failures of houses engaged in extensive business; that within the same period a decline of twenty millions had occurred in their local stocks; . . . that the immense amount of merchandise in their warehouses had fallen in value at least thirty per cent.; that within a few weeks not less than twenty thousand individuals, depending upon their daily labor for their daily bread, had been discharged by their employers." To this sad statement, and to other representations of similar character, the president, after some hesitation, responded by convening Congress on the first Monday in September. He then sent in a message, explaining the general distress on grounds very different from those taken by most of the distressed. He spoke of the increase of banking capital, of bank notes and bank discounts, within the last year or two, showing its enormous extent.* "The consequences of this redundancy of credit," pursued the

* In 1834 the capital was about $200,000,000; in January, 1836, about $250,000,000. In 1834, bank notes in circulation were about $95,000,000; in 1836, about $140,000,000. In 1834, bank loans were about $325,000,000; in 1836, about $460,000,000. Another estimate shows that the bank notes in circulation in January, 1837, exceeded those of 1830 by eighty-eight millions!

president, "and of the spirit of reckless speculation engendered by it, were a foreign debt contracted by our citizens, estimated in March last at more than thirty millions of dollars; . . . the investment of thirty-nine and a half millions in unproductive public lands, in the years 1835 and 1836, while in the preceding year the sales amounted to only four and a half millions; . . . the diversion to other pursuits of much of the labor that should have been applied to agriculture, thereby contributing to the expenditure of large sums in the importation of grain from Europe, . . . in the first two quarters of the present year increased to more than two millions; and finally, without enumerating other injurious results, the rapid growth among all classes, and especially in our great commercial cities, of luxurious habits, founded too often on merely fancied wealth, and detrimental alike to the industry, the resources, and the morals of the people."

Independent treasury.

The president expressly disclaimed any suggestions for relieving the embarrassments that had thus arisen. "Such measures," he remarked, "are not within the constitutional province of the general government." But he advocated the adoption of some system to relieve the government, which, since the suspension of specie payment by the banks, had had serious difficulties of its own. In the first place, the banks failed to restore the deposits of the treasury, and, in the second place, individuals were unable, for want of specie, if not for want of any funds whatsoever, to pay their debts to the nation. A temporary relief, both to the treasury and to its debtors, was proposed in the issue of treasury notes. But the great thing with the president was to make some lasting provision against the recurrence of similar deficiencies in the government revenues. He therefore proposed the organization of an independent treasury, — its opponents called it a sub-

treasury, — in order to do away with banks, both national and state, as keepers of the public moneys, and substituting a number of offices in the principal cities, under the control of the administration. That this scheme, as the president afterwards remarked, "should have given rise to great diversity of opinion, cannot be a subject of surprise. After the collection and custody of the public moneys had been for so many years connected with and made subsidiary to the advancement of private interests, a return to the simple and self-denying ordinances of the Constitution could not but be difficult." Herein, however, the opposition differed from the chief magistrate. "The project," said Clay, in the Senate, "is neither desirable nor practicable, nor within the constitutional power of the general government, nor just; it is contrary to the habits of the people, and dangerous to their liberties." The majority was on this side; nor did the independent treasury find favor enough with Congress to be established until nearly three years after its proposal, (July, 1840.) It was repealed the very next year, (August, 1841,) but reëstablished five years later, (1846.)

Insolvency of states.

While the national finances were slowly recovering themselves, the state finances, with some exceptions, appeared to be on the brink of ruin. Whatever might be the cause, — whether the excess of speculation, as the administration argued, or the administration system itself, as the opposition maintained, — certain it is that the states had run a race of extravagance and hazard unparalleled in our history. In the two years preceding the commercial crisis, the issue of state stocks — that is, the amount of money borrowed by the states — was nearly one hundred millions of dollars. The inevitable consequences followed. While such as had any thing to support their credit were deeply bowed, those that had nothing — those that had borrowed not so much to develop their resources

as to supply the want of resources — fell, collapsed and shattered. Some states — Maryland, (January, 1842,) and Pennsylvania, (August, 1842) — paid the interest on their debts only by certificates, and by those only partially. Others — Indiana, (July, 1841,) Arkansas, (July, 1841,) and Illinois, (January, 1842) — made no payment at all. Two — Michigan, (January, 1842,) and Louisiana, (December, 1842) — ceased not merely to pay, but in part to acknowledge their dues, alleging that the frauds or failures of their agents, from which they had unquestionably suffered, released them from at least a portion of their obligations.

Repudiation in Mississippi.

But in this, as in every other respect, in extent as well as in priority of insolvency, Mississippi took the lead. As early as January, 1841, Governor McNutt suggested to the legislature the "repudiating the sale of five millions of the bonds of the year 1838, on account of fraud and illegality." These bonds had been issued in support of the Union Bank, which began to show very decided signs of instability the year preceding the governor's suggestion. The fraud that was so great as to require the repudiation of the bonds, consisted chiefly in the fact that they had been sold on credit, or, as the governor insisted, below par, against a sale of which sort there was a particular reservation in the charter of the bank. Even if the sale was a fraudulent one, which many in as well as out of Mississippi denied, the penalty attached not to the bondholders, who had paid their money in good faith that it would be returned to them, but to the bank commissioners by whom the bonds were sold, or to the bank itself, by which the commissioners had been appointed. Not thus reasoned Governor McNutt, who, to the remonstrance of a foreign house holding a large portion of the bonds, replied, "This state will never pay the five millions of dollars of state bonds issued in June, 1838, or any portion of the

interest due, or to become due thereon," (July, 1841.) This was written in spite of the resolutions of the Mississippi legislature to stand by their bonds, the resolutions having been passed some months before. But in the interval, a change had taken place in the opinion of the state, partly from motives of expediency, but partly, also, from constitutional scruples, caused by a provision in the constitution that the assent of two successive legislatures, with public notice intervening, was necessary to the use of the state credit — a provision not complied with in the issue of the bonds in question. At all events, the next session of the legislature proved that the governor was supported in his position. Mississippi deliberately repudiated her debts, (1842.) Her example was imitated at the same time by the neighboring territory of Florida.

National credit.

Eight states and a territory were thus sunk into bankruptcy, some of them into what was worse than bankruptcy. It was not, of course, without dishonor or without injury to the Union of which they were members. When a national loan was attempted to be effected abroad, not a bidder could be found for it, or for any part of it, in all Europe, (1842.) This was but a trifle, however, amid the storm of reproach that swelled against the United States. "I do not wonder," wrote the Boston clergyman William Ellery Channing, "that Europe raises a cry of indignation against this country; I wish it could come to us in thunder." Nor did it seem undeserved by the nation, as a whole, when Florida, still repudiating its debt as a territory, was admitted as a state, (1845.) Against this sign of insensibility on the part of the nation, there were happily to be set some proofs of returning honor on the part of the states, Pennsylvania taking the lead in wiping away her debts and her stains, (1845.)

CHAPTER VII.

Annexation of Texas.

Recognition of Texas.

One of the later communications of President Jackson to Congress had been upon the subject of Texas and its independence. He was decided in recommending caution, for reasons which will presently appear, (December, 1836.) But Congress declaring its recognition of the new state, Jackson assented in the last moments of his administration.

Settlement of that state.

A quarter of a century before, parties from the United States began to cross over to join in the Mexican struggle against Spain, (1813.) It was then uncertain whether Texas formed a part of Mexico or of Louisiana, the boundary being undetermined until the time of the treaty concerning Florida, (1819–21.) At that time, Texas was distinctly abandoned to Spain, from whose possession it immediately passed to that of her revolted province of Mexico. Soon after, on Mexican invitation, a number of colonists from the United States, under the lead of Stephen F. Austin, of Missouri, undertook to settle the still unoccupied territory, (1821.) It was no expedition to plunder or to destroy, but what it professed to be — to colonize. Notwithstanding the difficulties of the enterprise itself, as well as those created by the continual changes in the Mexican government, it prospered to such a degree, that several thousand settlers were gathered in during the ten years ensuing.

Revolution. Strong in their numbers, stronger still in their energies, the Texans aspired to a more definite organization than they possessed. Without any purpose, at least professed, of revolution, they formed a constitution, and sent Austin to ask the admission of Texas, as a separate state, into the Mexican republic, (1833.) This was denied, and Austin thrown into prison. But no outbreak followed for more than two years. Then the Mexican government, resolving to reduce the Texans to entire submission, despatched a force to arrest the officers under the state constitution, and to disarm the people. The Texan Lexington was Gonzales, where the first resistance was made, (September 28, 1835.) The Texan Philadelphia was a place called Washington, where a convention declared the independence of the state, (March 2, 1836,) and adopted a constitution, (March 17.) The Texan Saratoga and Yorktown, two in one, was on the shores of the San Jacinto, where General Houston, commander-in-chief of the insurgents, gained a decisive victory over the Mexican president, Santa Anna, (April 21.) Six months afterwards, Houston was chosen president of the republic of Texas, (October.)

Project of annexation. In his inaugural speech, he expressed the desire of the people to join the United States. Nothing could be more natural. With few exceptions, they were emigrants from the land to which they wished to be reunited. It was but natural, for the same reason, that a large number of those whom they had left behind them should wish their return, partly from old associations, and partly from the new ones connected with their revolution. Then there were other motives to produce the same inclination. The cession of the Louisiana claims to Texas in the Florida treaty had been vehemently opposed by many who would therefore be earnest to recover the territory then surrendered. Again and again was the effort made by the

United States to get back from Mexico what had been ceded to Spain, (1825–35.) With a very considerable party in the south, there was an additional incentive to regain Texas, in the congeniality of its climate, its resources, and its customs, especially the establishment of slavery. But the very fact that slavery existed in Texas was a strong reason with another considerable party in the north to oppose its admission to the Union. The same party, moreover, would have little desire to recover the Texan territory, even admitting that it had ever been surrendered, as well as little sympathy with the character or the history of the Texans, who, in their eyes, seemed a wild and lawless set, unfit to share in the established institutions of the United States. To these objections must be added one, confined to no single portion of the Union, but very generally entertained, on account of the claim of Mexico to the Texan territory. Upon this point, the message of President Jackson, alluded to at the beginning of the chapter, dwelt with emphasis. He stated plainly that the acknowledgment of Texan independence was the acknowledgment of the Texan title to the territory, in contradiction to the Mexican assertion of sovereignty. It was the more delicate a question on account of the differences existing between the governments of Mexico and of the United States. The former complained of continued invasions of her territory, in violation of all amity and neutrality. The latter demanded redress for spoliations of property and injuries to persons from the time that Mexico became independent. Notwithstanding these various complications, the independence of Texas was recognized by the United States, as has been mentioned, leaving the project of annexation to the future.

Texas refused admission.

When Texas, soon after the opening of Van Buren's administration, presented herself for admission to the Union, her offers were declined, and then

withdrawn, (1837.) The next year, William C. Preston, a senator of South Carolina, brought forward resolutions in favor of the proposed annexation; but they were rejected.

Relations with Great Britain.

The attention of the country was turned in another direction. An insurrection in Canada was immediately supported by American parties, one of whom, in company with some Canadian refugees, after pillaging the New York arsenals, seized upon Navy Island, a British possession in the Niagara River. The steamer Caroline, engaged in bringing over men, arms, and stores to the island, was destroyed, though at the time on the American shore, by a British detachment, (December, 1837.) The deed was instantly avowed by the minister of Great Britain at Washington as an act of self-defence on the British side. Three years afterwards, (November, 1840,) one Alexander M'Leod, sheriff of Niagara, in Canada, and as such a participator in the destruction of the Caroline, was arrested in New York on the charge of murder, an American having lost his life when the steamer was destroyed. The British government demanded his release, in doing which they were sustained by the United States administration, on the ground that M'Leod was but an agent or soldier of Great Britain. But the authorities of New York held fast to their prisoner, and brought him to trial. Had harm come to him, his government stood pledged to declare war; but he was acquitted for want of proof, (1841.) Congress subsequently passed an act requiring that similar cases should be tried only before United States courts. The release of M'Leod did not settle the affair of the Caroline; this still remained. There were, or there had been, other difficulties upon the Maine frontier, where the boundary line had never yet been run. Collisions took place, and others, between the Maine militia

and the British troops, had been but just prevented, (1839.) Nor was this all. Far away, upon the African coast, British cruisers were claiming a right to visit American vessels, in carrying out the provisions for the suppression of the slave trade. The right was asserted in a quintuple treaty, to which Great Britain, France, Austria, Prussia, and Russia were parties, (October, 1841;) but the United States denied it altogether.

Treaty of Washington.

Meanwhile William Henry Harrison, the choice of the whig party, had succeeded to the presidency, (March, 1841.) On his death, a month after, John Tyler, vice president, became president. His secretary of state, Daniel Webster, proposed to the British minister at Washington to take up the question of the north-eastern boundary. The offer led to the appointment by the British government of a special envoy in the person of Lord Ashburton, to whom was committed the negotiation upon the boundary, and upon various other points of controversy. Soon after his arrival in Washington, (April, 1842,) conferences were opened between him and the American secretary; commissioners from Maine and Massachusetts being consulted upon all subjects pertaining to the boundary. The treaty of Washington, ratified by the Senate four months afterwards, (August 20,) embraced almost every subject of dissension with Great Britain. It settled the north-eastern boundary; it put down the claim to a right of visit, and in such a way as to lead to the denial of the claim by European powers who had previously admitted it. Such were the advantages gained by the United States on both these points, the leading ones of the treaty, that it was styled in England the Ashburton capitulation. The treaty also provided for the mutual surrender of fugitives from justice; an object of great importance, considering the recent experiences on the Canada frontier. For the affair of the Caro-

line, an apology, or what amounted to one, was made by the British minister. Even the old quarrel about impressment was put to rest, not by the treaty, but by a letter from Webster to Ashburton, repeating the rule originally laid down by Jefferson, "that the vessel being American shall be evidence that the seamen on board are such," adding, as the present and future principle of the American government, that "in every regularly documented American merchant vessel, the crew who navigate it will find their protection in the flag which is over them." In short, every difficulty with Great Britain was settled by the treaty, or by the accompanying negotiations, except one, the boundary of Oregon, on which no serious difference had as yet appeared.

Landmark in our history

"I am willing," said Webster in the Senate, nearly four years subsequently, "to appeal to the public men of the age, whether, in 1842, and in the city of Washington, something was not done for the suppression of crime, for the true exposition of the principles of public law, for the freedom and security of commerce on the ocean, and for the peace of the world." He might have made an even broader appeal. The treaty of Washington raised the growing nation to its place as a foremost power on the earth. Compare it with all previous treaties with Great Britain, compare it with even the recent treaty with France, which had done much to elevate the national position of the United States, and we find that the treaty of Washington is a landmark in our history.

Sedition in Rhode Island. Approach.

To return to internal relations. The eye is at once caught by strange and threatening movements in Rhode Island. That state, still under its charter government, now a century and three quarters old, had long been agitated by efforts to change its ancient institutions. It must be acknowledged that these admitted of

improvement, both on the score of suffrage, to which none but freeholders * and their eldest sons were entitled, and on that of representation, the freeholders themselves being very unequally represented, in consequence of changes in the population of the towns, a town of former importance enjoying a larger representation than one that had latterly become its superior. New constitutions were twice proposed, (1824, 1834;) but in vain. At length, a Suffrage Association, as it was styled, spread itself, with meetings, processions, and badges, over the state, calling upon the people, without regard to the legal voters or the legal authorities, to unite in a convention, and organize a new constitution, (1840.)

Outbreak. The sedition thus prepared broke out with the meeting of the convention, (October, 1841.) A constitution, establishing universal suffrage and equal representation, was adopted, and submitted to the popular vote. Before the vote was taken, another constitution, of very nearly the same tenor,† was begun upon by a convention called by the legislature, according to the forms of law, (November.) The first constitution, called the People's, was adopted by a nominal vote of fourteen thousand, the whole number of voters in the state being twenty-two thousand; but as the people's party never again mustered eight thousand votes, it is fair to conclude — as was proved, indeed, by depositions at the time — that the fourteen thousand were the results of deception, (December.) The Landholders' Constitution, as the second instrument was styled, on being completed, (February, 1842,) and submitted

* Of an estate valued at $134, or renting for seven dollars. This was the rule of 1798.

† The chief differences being in the length of residence entitling a native to vote, and in the requirement by the second constitution that a naturalized citizen must be a freeholder before he could vote.

not merely to the freeholders, but to the citizens at large, was rejected, chiefly because the party in favor of retaining the charter government united with the people's party in opposition, (March.) This left the charter and the People's Constitution face to face, the former being the law of the state, the latter the law of a faction. To sustain the law of the state, the legislature declared fine and imprisonment the penalties of presiding at illegal meetings or of figuring upon illegal tickets, — in other words, of taking part in the elections under the law of the faction. A call for aid was at the same time made upon the president of the United States by the governor of Rhode Island. President Tyler replied that aid should be forthcoming upon the commission of any act of violence by the faction. This body, nowise intimidated by either state or national authorities, went on with its elections, choosing its leader, Thomas W. Dorr, to be governor of Rhode Island, (April.)

Civil war.

War soon followed. Dorr organized his government in the midst of armed men at Providence, while at Newport Governor King, surrounded by the constituted authorities, renewed his summons for assistance from the nation. United States troops were moved to Newport, (May.) On the 18th of the same month, Dorr, at the head of an armed force, made an ineffectual attempt to get possession of the Providence arsenal, defended as it was by braver men than he or his soldiers. At this, all the better men of his faction, including most of his legislature and state officers, abandoned his cause, while he fled the state. But it was only more decisively to try his fortunes in the field. A month had hardly passed when news came that Dorr, with two or three hundred followers, was throwing up intrenchments at Chepachet, a village about ten miles from Providence. It took but a week for three thousand volunteers to come together and march against the

post of the insurgents, which was found abandoned. There ended the civil war, (June 27.) Three months later a convention of the state adopted a new constitution, providing for the reforms which Dorr and his party had sought through sedition and strife, (September.*)

New states and territories.

Other states were organizing themselves more peaceably. Arkansas, the first state admitted since Missouri, (June 15, 1836,) was followed by Michigan, (January 26, 1837.) Wisconsin, organized as a single territory, (1836,) was presently divided as Wisconsin and Iowa, (1838.) Then Iowa was admitted a state, (March 3, 1845,†) and at the same date Florida became a member of the Union.

Movements concerning Texas.

All the while, Texas remained the object of desire and of debate. The administration continued its negotiations, now with Mexico, deprecating the continuance of hostilities with Texas, and then again with Texas itself, proposing new motives of alliance and new means of annexation with the United States. President Tyler was strongly in favor of consummating the annexation. In this he was supported by a stronger and stronger inclination to the same end on the part of the south. But the north was growing more and more adverse to the plan. The old arguments were mingled with new ones. A great deal of stress was now laid on the danger of Texas throwing itself into the arms of another nation, of Great Britain, for instance, or of France; the idea being that the United States would suffer from having upon their frontier a state in foreign dependence. But the main dispute as to Texas came from the question of slavery.

* Accepted in November, and put in operation in the following May, (1843.) It was similar in its provisions to the Landholder's Constitution of a few months before.

† Again in 1846, but not actually entering until 1848.

Question of slavery.

"Few calamities," wrote Abel P. Upshur, then secretary of state, "could befall this country more to be deplored than the abolition of domestic slavery in Texas," (September, 1843.) Some months later, he wrote to Texas to the effect that she could not possibly keep up slavery without the aid of the United States, (January, 1844.) All this was based upon the supposition that England was endeavoring to get Texas under her control, and then to clear the state of its slaves. It was afterwards stated by no less an authority than General Houston, that the supposition was totally groundless. But, however this may have been, the point is plain that the annexation of Texas was regarded as necessary to the interests of slavery, both in that country and in the United States. The reason why it was so with the United States is evident enough; not only was an immense market for slaves closed, but an immense refuge for slaves was opened, in case Texas should cease to be slaveholding. "Annexation," wrote John C. Calhoun, then secretary of state, "was forced on the government of the United States in self-defence," (April, 1844.) Such, then, was the motive of the secretaries and the president, all southern men, and devotedly supported by the south, in striving for an addition to the slaveholding states in the shape of Texas. The more they strove on this ground, the more they were opposed in the free states. It was the Missouri battle over again. Nay, it was more than that; in that, said the north, we contended against the admission of one of our own territories, but in this contest we are fighting against the admission of a foreign state.

A compromise.

Like all the other great differences of the nation, this difference concerning Texas was susceptible of compromise. At first, the administration attempted to escape it, preparing a treaty which declared Texas a member of the Union, (April 12, 1844.) The treaty was

rejected by the Senate; but the nation sustained the project of annexation; and in the next session of Congress both Senate and House united in joint resolutions of the same purport as the rejected treaty, (March 1, 1845.) Here, however, there was a compromise. The resolutions provided that the Texan territory, when sufficiently peopled, might be divided into five states. "Such states," it was added, "as may be formed out of that portion of said territory lying south of thirty-six degrees thirty minutes north latitude, commonly known as the Missouri Compromise line, shall be admitted into the Union with or without slavery, as the people of each state asking admission may desire; and in such state or states as shall be formed out of said territory north of said Missouri Compromise line, slavery or involuntary servitude (except for crime) shall be prohibited." Texas assented to the terms of the resolutions, (July 4,) and was soon after formally enrolled amongst the United States of America, (December 29.)

Consequences. The democratic party, espousing the project of annexation before it was fulfilled, carried the election of James K. Polk as president and George M. Dallas as vice president. "Well may the boldest fear," said the new president in his inaugural address, "and the wisest tremble, when incurring responsibilities on which may depend our country's peace and prosperity, and in some degree the hopes and happiness of the whole human family," (March, 1845.) He found the annexation of Texas accomplished. But the consequences were yet to be seen and borne.

CHAPTER VIII.

War with Mexico.

Causes of war: Mexican.

Mexico had all along declared the annexation of Texas by the United States would be an act of hostility. As soon as Congress resolved upon it, the Mexican minister at Washington demanded his passports, (March 6, 1845,) and the Mexican government suspended intercourse with the envoy of the United States, (April 2.) "War"—so the Mexicans persisted—"was the only recourse of the Mexican government." The cause was the occupation of a state which they still claimed as a province of their own, notwithstanding it had been independent now for nine years, and as such recognized by several of the European powers in addition to the United States.

American.

With the United States, the preservation of Texas was not the only cause of war. Indeed, for the time, it was no cause at all, according to the administration. If there was any disposition to take up arms, it came from what the president styled "the system of insult and spoliation" under which Americans had long been suffering; merchants losing their property, and sailors their liberty, by seizures on Mexican waters and in Mexican ports. In spite of a treaty, now fourteen years old, (1831,) the wrongs complained of had continued, until President Jackson, in the last month of his administration, (February, 1837,) thought it best to recommend demands for justice

"from on board one of our vessels of war on the coast of Mexico." After some delays, the Mexican government entered into a convention, (1839,) by which a commission was appointed to examine the American claims, (1840.) The term of the commission having expired before more than a third of the claims had been examined, (1842,) the United States pressed the appointment of a new commission; but in vain. Instead, however, of dealing harshly with the Mexicans, the amounts acknowledged by them to be due to Americans were paid, so far as paid at all, by the United States government, their payment by the Mexican government being postponed, (1843.) All this, it is plain, would never have brought about war, had there been no other exciting cause.

Boundary of Texas.

This cause was close at hand. In annexing Texas, the United States government understood the territory to extend as far as the Rio Grande. For considering this the boundary there were two reasons; one, that the Texans had proclaimed it such, and the other, that it was apparently implied to be such in the treaty ceding the country west of the Sabine to Spain, a quarter of a century before. Accordingly, American troops were moved to Corpus Christi, (August, 1845,) and, six months afterwards, (March, 1846,) to the Rio Grande, with orders "to repel any invasion of the Texan territory which might be attempted by the Mexican forces." On the other side, Mexico protested altogether against the line of the Rio Grande. The River Nueces, according to Mexican authority, was the boundary of Texas. Even supposing Texas surrendered by the Mexicans, which it was not, they still retained the territory between the Nueces and the Rio Grande — a territory containing but few settlements, and those not Texan, but purely Mexican. In support of this position, the Mexican General Arista was ordered to cross

the Rio Grande and defend the country against the invader, (April, 1846.)

Mission from United States.

During these movements a mission was sent from the United States to Mexico, (November, 1845.) The minister went authorized to propose and to carry out an adjustment of all the difficulties between the two countries. But he was refused a hearing; the Mexican government, fresh from one of its revolutions, insisting that the question of Texas must be disposed of, and on Mexican terms, before entering upon any general negotiations. The bearer of the olive branch was obliged to return, (March, 1846.)

Hostilities.

As the American troops, some three thousand strong, under General Taylor, approached the Rio Grande, the inhabitants retired; at one place, Point Isabel, burning their dwellings. This certainly did not look much like being on American or on Texan ground. But Taylor, obedient to his orders, kept on, until he took post by the Rio Grande, opposite the Mexican town of Matamoras, (March 28, 1846.) There, about a month later, (April 24,) he was thus addressed by the Mexican General Arista: "Pressed and forced into war, we enter into a struggle which we cannot avoid without being unfaithful to what is most sacred to men." A Mexican force was simultaneously sent across the stream, to what the Americans considered their territory. Some collisions had already taken place; but the first act to begin hostilities occurred on the same day of the Mexican movements, when a squadron of dragoons, sent by Taylor to reconnoitre the Mexicans, fell in with a much superior force, and, after a skirmish, surrendered. The next day but one, Taylor, as previously authorized by his government, called upon the states of Texas and Louisiana for five thousand volunteers. As soon as the news reached Washington, the president informed Congress

that "war exists, and exists by the act of Mexico herself," (May 11.) Congress took the same ground, and gave the president authority to call fifty thousand volunteers into the field, (May 13.) It was ten days later, but of course before any tidings of these proceedings could have been received, that Mexico made a formal declaration of war, (May 23.) The question as to which nation began hostilities, must forever depend upon the question of the Texan boundary. If this was the River Nueces, the United States began war the summer before. If, on the contrary, it was the Rio Grande, the Mexicans, as President Polk asserted, were the aggressors. But there is no possible way of deciding which river it was that formed the actual boundary. The assertion of Mexico, that it was the Nueces, is as reasonable as the declaration of Texas, supported by the United States, that it was the Rio Grande.

Disparity of combatants.

The forces between which hostilities commenced were both small, the United States army being the smaller of the two. But this disparity was as nothing compared with that between the nations. The United States went to war with Mexico very much as they would have gone to war with one or more of their own number. Mexico, broken by revolutions, had neither government nor army to defend her; there were officials, there were soldiers, but there was no strength, no efficiency in either. Doubtless Mexico trusted to the divisions of her enemy, to the opposition which parties in the United States would make to the war. But the parties of the United States were one, in contrast with the parties of Mexico.

Oregon controversy.

On another point, the Mexicans could build up better founded hopes. At the very time that hostilities opened between the United States and Mexico, there was serious danger of a rupture between the United States and Great Britain. It sprang from conflicting claims

to the distant territory of Oregon. Those of the United States were based, first, upon American voyages to the Pacific coast, chiefly upon one made by Captain Gray, in the Columbia, from which the great river of the north-west took its name, (1792;) secondly, upon the acquisition of Louisiana with all the Spanish rights to the western shores, (1803;) and thirdly, upon an expedition under Captain Lewis and Lieutenant Clarke, of the United States army, by whom the Missouri was traced towards its source, and the Columbia descended to the Pacific Ocean, (1803–6.) Against these, the British government asserted various claims of discovery and occupancy. Twice the two nations agreed to a joint possession of the country in dispute, (1818, 1827;) twice the United States proposed a dividing line, once under Monroe, and again under Tyler. The rejection of the latter proposal had led to a sort of war cry, during the presidential election then pending, (1844,) that Oregon must be held. President Polk renewed the offer, but on less favorable terms, and it was rejected, (1845.) Agreeably to his recommendation, a twelve months' notice, preliminary to the termination of the existing arrangements concerning the occupation of Oregon, was formally given by the United States government, (1846.) Meanwhile emigration to Oregon had been proceeding on so large a scale during the few years previous, that there were some thousands of Americans settled upon the territory. It was a grave juncture, therefore, that had arrived.

Settlement. But it was happily terminated on proposals, now emanating from Great Britain, by which the line of forty-nine degrees was constituted the boundary; the right of navigating the Columbia being secured to the British, (June 15, 1846.) Thus vanished the prospect of a war with Great Britain, in addition to the war with Mexico. But its existence, if only for a time, explains a part at

least of the confidence with which the Mexicans entered into the strife. It does away, on the other hand, with the apparent want of magnanimity in the Americans to measure themselves with antagonists so much their inferiors.

Conquest of north-east of Mexico.

The Mexican General Arista commenced the bombardment of the American position, afterwards called Fort Brown from its gallant defender, Major Brown, (May 3.) General Taylor was then with the bulk of his troops at Point Isabel. Having made sure of that post, he marched back to the relief of Fort Brown, and on the way engaged with the enemy at Palo Alto, (May 8,) and at Resaca de la Palma, (May 9.) With a force so much inferior, that the most serious apprehensions had been excited for its safety, the Americans came off victors in both actions. Such was the effect upon the Mexicans, that they at once recrossed the Rio Grande, and even retreated to some distance on their side of the river. Taylor followed, carrying the war into the enemy's country, and occupying Matamoras, (May 18.) A long pause ensued, to wait for reënforcements, and indeed for plans; the war being wholly unprepared for on the American side. But the news of the first victories aroused the whole nation. Even the opponents of the war yielded their principles so far as to give their sympathies to the brave men who had carried their arms farther from the limits of the United States than had ever before been done by an American army. Volunteers gathered from all quarters in numbers for which it was positively difficult to provide. At length, with considerably augmented forces, Taylor set out again, supported by Generals Worth and Wool among many other eminent officers. Monterey, a very important place in this part of Mexico, was taken after a three days' resistance under General Ampudia, (September 21–23.) An armistice of several weeks followed. Subsequently, Taylor

marched southward as far as Victoria; but on the recall of a portion of his troops to take part in other operations, he fell back into a defensive position in the north, (January, 1847.) There, at Buena Vista, he was attacked by a comparatively large army under Santa Anna, then generalissimo of Mexico, who, deeming himself secure of his prey, sent a summons of surrender, which Taylor instantly declined. The dispositions for the battle had been made in great part by General Wool, to whom, with many of the other officers, the victory achieved by the Americans deserves to be ascribed, as well as to the resolute commander. It was a bloody engagement, continuing for two successive days, (February 22, 23.) Taylor was never more truly the hero than when he wrote to Henry Clay, whose son had fallen in the fight, that, in remembering the dead, "I can say with truth that I feel no exultation in our success." Santa Anna, meanwhile, was in full retreat, leaving the Americans in secure possession of all the north-eastern country. Six months later, Taylor sent a large number of his remaining men to act elsewhere, (August;) then, leaving General Wool in command, he returned to the United States, (November.)

Conquest of Chihuahua.

Soon after the fall of Monterey, a force under General Wool was detached to penetrate into the northern province of Chihuahua. It did not go by any means so far. But at about the same time, an expedition from the north, headed by Colonel Doniphan, marched down upon the province, taking possession first of El Paso, (December 27,) and then, after a battle with the Mexicans, under Heredia, at the pass of Sacramento, (February 28, 1847,) of Chihuahua, the capital, (March 1.) Doniphan presently evacuated his conquest, (April.) Early in the following year, Chihuahua became the object of a third expedition, under General Price, who, coming

from the same direction as Doniphan, again occupied the town, (March 7, 1848,) defeating the Mexicans at the neighboring Santa Cruz de las Rosales, (March 16.) The whole story of the Chihuahua expeditions is that of border forays rather than of regular campaigns.

Conquest of New Mexico.

Both Doniphan and Price made their descents from New Mexico, which had been taken possession of by the Americans under General Kearney in the first months of the war, (August, 1846.) So scanty and so prostrate was the population as to offer no resistance, not even to the occupation of the capital, Santa Fe, (August 18.) But some months after, when Kearney had proceeded to California, and Doniphan, after treating with the Navajo Indians, had gone against Chihuahua, an insurrection, partly of Mexicans and partly of Indians, broke out at a village fifty miles from Santa Fe. The American governor, Charles Bent, and many others, both Mexicans and Americans, were murdered; battles, also, were fought, before the insurgents were reduced, by Price, (January, 1847.)

Conquest of California.

Ere the tidings of the war reached the Pacific coast, a band of Americans, partly trappers and partly settlers, — "a curious set," says an Englishman who saw them, — declared their independence of Mexico at Sonoma, a town of small importance not far from San Francisco, (July 4, 1846.) The leader of the party was John C. Fremont, a captain in the United States Engineers, who had recently received instructions from his government to secure a hold upon California. A few days after their declaration, Fremont and his followers joined the American Commodore Sloat, who, aware of the war, had taken Monterey, (July 7,) and entered the Bay of San Francisco, (July 9.) Sloat was soon succeeded by Commodore Stockton; and he, in conjunction with Fremont, took

possession of Ciudad de los Angeles, the capital of Upper California, (August 13.) All this was done without opposition from the scattered Mexicans of the province, or from their feeble authorities. But some weeks later, a few braver spirits collected, and, driving the Americans from the capital, succeeded likewise in recovering the greater part of California, (September, October.) On the approach of General Kearney from New Mexico, a month or two afterwards, he was met in battle at San Pasqual, (December 6,) and so hemmed in by the enemy as to be in great danger, until relieved by a force despatched to his assistance by Commodore Stockton. The commodore and the general, joining forces, retook Ciudad de los Angeles, after two actions with its defenders, (January 10, 1847.) A day or two later, Fremont succeeded in bringing the main body of Mexicans in arms to a capitulation at Cowenga (January 13.) California was again, and more decidedly than before, an American possession. Its conquerors, having no more Mexicans to contend with, turned against one another, and quarrelled for the precedence as vigorously as they had struggled for victory. Lower California was afterwards assailed, but under different commanders. La Paz and San José, both inconsiderable places, were occupied in the course of the year. On the opposite shore, Guaymas was taken by a naval force under Captain Lavalette, (October,) and Mazatlan by the fleet under Commodore Shubrick, (November.) From time to time the Mexicans rallied against the invaders, but without success. It was all a series of skirmishes, fought in the midst of lonely mountains and on far-stretching shores, rather than of ordinary battles, that had reduced California beneath the American power.

And now to return to the eastern side. From the first, a blockade of the ports in the Gulf of Mexico was but poorly maintained. Then the American fleet embarked upon vari-

Operations in Gulf of Mexico.

ous operations. Twice was Alvarado, a port to the south of Vera Cruz, attacked by Commodore Conner, and twice it was gallantly defended, (August 7, October 15, 1846.) Then Commodore Perry went against Tobasco, a little distance up a river on the southern coast; but, though he took some prizes and some hamlets, he did not gain the town, (October 23–26.) The only really successful operation was the occupation of Tampico, which the Mexicans abandoned on the approach of their enemies, (November 15.)

March upon city of Mexico.

Early in the following spring the fleet and the army combined in an attack upon Vera Cruz. Anticipations of success, however high amongst the troops and their officers, were not very generally entertained even by their own countrymen, Vera Cruz, or its castle of San Juan d'Ulloa, having been represented over and over again, in Europe and in America, as impregnable. Nevertheless, a bombardment of a few days obliged the garrison, under General Morales, to give up the town and the castle together, (March 23–26, 1847.) Once masters there, the Americans beheld the road to the city of Mexico lying open before them; but here, again, their way was supposed to be beset by insurmountable difficulties. They pressed on, nine or ten thousand strong, General Scott at their head, supported by Generals Worth, Pillow, Quitman, and Twiggs, with many officers of tried and of untried reputation. However skilful the leaders, or however valiant the men, it was a daring enterprise to advance upon the capital. In other directions, along the northern boundary, the war had been carried into remote and comparatively unpeopled portions of the country. Here the march lay through a region provided with defenders and with defences, where men would fight for their homes, and where their homes, being close at hand, would give them aid as well as

inspiration. The march upon Mexico was by all means the great performance of the war.

Battles on the way. Its difficulties soon appeared. At Cerro Gordo, sixty miles from Vera Cruz, Santa Anna posted thirteen thousand of his Mexicans in a mountain pass, to whose natural strength he had added by fortification. It took two days to force a passage, the Americans losing about five hundred, but inflicting a far greater loss on their brave opponents, (April 18–19.) Here, however, they paused; a part of the force was soon to be discharged, and Scott decided that he would make his dismissals and wait for the empty places to be filled. He accordingly advanced slowly to Puebla, while the Mexicans kept in the background, or appeared only as guerillas, (May 28.) The guerilla warfare had been prognosticated as the one insuperable obstacle to the progress of the American army; it proved harassing, but by no means fatal. During the delay ensuing on land, the fleet in the gulf, under Commodore Perry, took Tuspan and Tobasco, both being but slightly defended, (April 18—June 15.) At length, reënforcements having reached the army, making it not quite eleven thousand strong, it resumed its march, and entered the valley of Mexico, (August 10.)

In valley of Mexico. There the Mexicans stood, Santa Anna still at their head, thirty-five thousand in their ranks, regular troops and volunteers, old and young, rich and poor, men of the professions and men of the trades,—all joined in the defence of their country, now threatened at its very heart. They wanted much, however, that was essential to success. Hope was faint, and even courage sank beneath the errors and the intrigues of the commanding officers, to whom, speaking generally, it was vain to look for example or for guidance. Behind the army was the government, endeavoring to unite itself, yet still rent and

enfeebled to the last degree. Even the clergy, chafed by the seizure of church property to meet the exigencies of the state, were divided, if not incensed. It was a broken nation, and yet all the more worthy of respect for the last earnest resistance which it was making to the foe. Never had armies a more magnificent country to assail or to defend than that into which the Americans had penetrated. They fought in defiles or upon plains, vistas of lakes and fields before them, mountain heights above them, the majesty of nature every where mingling with the contention of man. Fourteen miles from the city, battles began at Contreras, where a Mexican division under General Valencia was totally routed, (August 19–20.) The next engagement followed immediately, at Churubusco, six miles from the capital, Santa Anna himself being there completely defeated, (August 20.) An armistice suspended further movements for a fortnight, when an American division under Worth made a successful assault on a range of buildings called Molino del Rey, close to the city. This action, though the most sanguinary of the entire war, — both Mexicans and Americans surpassing all their previous deeds, — was without results, (September 8.) A few days later, the fourth and final engagement in the valley took place at Chapultepec, a fortress just above Molino del Rey. Within the lines was the Mexican Military College, and bravely did the students defend it, mere boys outvying veterans in feats of valor. In vain, nevertheless; the college and the fortress yielded together, (September 12–13.) The next day Scott, with six thousand five hundred men, the whole of his army remaining in the field, entered the city of Mexico, (September 14.)

Last actions.

Santa Anna retired in the direction of Puebla, which he vainly attempted to take from Colonel Childs. The object of the Mexican general was to cut off

the communication between Scott and the seaboard; but he did not succeed. A few last actions of an inferior character, a few skirmishes with bands of partisans, and the war was over in that part of the country. The American generals betook themselves to quarrels and arrests; Scott being some months afterwards superseded by General Butler, (February, 1848.)

Composition of United States forces.

Now that their exploits have been described, the United States armies are to be understood for what they were. It was no regular force, prepared by years of discipline to meet the foe, that followed Taylor, Scott, and the other leaders, to the field. The few regiments of United States troops were lost, in respect to numbers, though not to deeds, amid the thousands of volunteers that came swarming from every part of the Union. To bring these irregular troops into any effective condition was more difficult than to meet the Mexicans. On the other hand, there was an animation about them, a personal feeling of emulation and of patriotism, which made the volunteers a far more valuable force than might have been supposed. After all, however, it was to the officers, to the pupils of West Point, to the intelligent, and, in many cases, devoted men, who left their occupations at home to sustain what they deemed the honor of their country abroad, that the successes of the various campaigns are chiefly to be ascribed. The effect of the war was to give the nation a much more military character than it had hitherto sustained, even in its own eyes.

Forced supplies.

One point in the American conduct of the war is yet to be noticed. As early as the fifth month of hostilities, (September, 1846,) the secretary of war instructed General Taylor to "draw supplies from the enemy without paying for them, and to require contributions, if in that way you are satisfied you can get abundant supplies."

The same instructions were sent to General Scott in the following spring. But both the generals declined the attempt of raising forced supplies. After the occupation of the capital, however, Scott exacted several large contributions from the conquered country. Another form of levying money was in the duties imposed upon all merchandise admitted into the Mexican ports occupied by the Americans. This, as the government allowed, "was, in effect, the seizure of the public revenues of Mexico;" the object being, as in the other cases, "to compel the enemy to contribute, as far as practicable, towards the expenses of the war."

Peace: first steps. The war had not continued three months, when the United States made an overture of peace, (July, 1846.) It was referred by the Mexican administration to the National Congress, and there it rested. In announcing to the American Congress the proposal which he had made, President Polk suggested the appropriation of a certain sum, as an indemnity for any Mexican territory that might be retained at the conclusion of the war. In the debate which followed, an administration representative from Pennsylvania, David Wilmot, moved a proviso to the proposed appropriation: "That there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in any territory on the continent of America, which shall hereafter be acquired by or annexed to the United States by virtue of this appropriation, or in any other manner whatsoever." The proviso was hastily adopted in the House; but it was too late to receive any action in the Senate before the close of the session, (August.) In the following session the proviso again passed the House, but was abandoned by that body on being rejected by the Senate.

Next steps. Provided with the sum which he thought necessary to insure negotiation, President Polk appointed

N. P. Trist, chief clerk of the state department, a commissioner to take out the plan of a treaty, requiring Mexico to cede a portion of her territory, but promising her some remuneration, (April, 1847.) It was several months after the commissioner's arrival at the American head quarters that he obtained an interview with any commissioners on the part of Mexico. He then met them several times, proposing his project and receiving theirs, the two being very far apart. The Mexicans were reluctant to yield any territory, even that beyond the Rio Grande, which had been claimed as a part of Texas. It went especially against their inclinations to open it to slavery; the instructions of the commissioners being quite positive on the point that any treaty to be signed by them must prohibit slavery in the ceded country. "No president of the United States," replied Commissioner Trist, "would dare to present any such treaty to the Senate." Nor was there any obstacle stronger than this against the agreement of the negotiators. They separated, without having accomplished any thing, (August, September.)

Treaty.

Trist was recalled, apparently for not pressing the claims of his government with greater vehemence. But he took it upon himself to remain where he was, and to treat with new commissioners, two months after the entrance of the American army into the city of Mexico, (November.) The result of battles rather than of negotiations was a treaty signed at Guadalupe Hidalgo, a suburb of the capital. By this instrument Mexico ceded the whole of Texas, New Mexico, and Upper California, while the United States agreed to surrender their other conquests, and to pay for those retained the sum of fifteen millions, besides assuming the old claims of their own citizens against Mexico to the amount of more than three millions, (February 2, 1848.) The treaty contained other provisions,

some of which were modified at Washington, and altered accordingly at Queretaro, where the Mexican Congress was called to ratify the peace. Ratifications were finally exchanged at Queretaro, (May 30,) and peace proclaimed at Washington, (July 4.) The Mexican territory — that is, the portion which remained — was rapidly evacuated.

Character of the war.

Thus ended a conflict of which the motives, the events, and the results have been very variously estimated. But this much may be historically said, that on the side of the United States the war had not merely a party, but rather a sectional character. What sectional causes there were to bring about hostilities, we have seen in relation to the annexation of Texas. What sectional issues there were to proceed from the treaty, we have yet to see. "It is a southern war," was the express statement of a writer of South Carolina.

CHAPTER IX.

Compromise of 1850.

New territory.

Within the limits of Texas, New Mexico, and California, there lay a vast region, containing upwards of eight hundred thousand square miles. All the United States, previously, comprehended but little beyond two millions. An addition, therefore, of considerably more than one third of the territory existing before the annexation of Texas had been brought to pass. Extraordinary as was this acquisition in extent, it was still more extraordinary in character. Not to dwell upon the variety of climate, of scenery, of soil, and of production, which it comprehended, there was within the limits of California a region of surpassing value. Just before the treaty with Mexico, (January, 1848,) the erection of a mill upon a branch of the Sacramento revealed the existence of gold, which was soon discovered in other places. To cover the soil with gold diggers, and to arouse the rest of the country to emigration, or to speculation, or at least to wondering interest, were the almost instantaneous consequences. "The acquisition of California," exclaimed President Polk, placing that district first upon his list, "and New Mexico, the settlement of the Oregon boundary, and the annexation of Texas, extending to the Rio Grande, are results which, combined, are of greater consequence, and will add more to the strength and wealth of the nation, than any which have preceded them since the adoption of the Constitution."

Difficulties. There was another side, nevertheless, even to the president. In communicating the exchange of ratifications between the United States and Mexico, he addressed Congress in this wise: "There has perhaps been no period since the warning so impressively given to his countrymen by Washington, to guard against geographical divisions and sectional parties, which appeals with greater force than the present to the patriotic, sober-minded, and reflecting of all parties and of all sections of our country. As we extend the blessings of the Union over new regions, shall we be so unwise as to endanger its existence by geographical divisions and dissensions?" This was written amid a perfect tumult of congressional and of popular discussions. The canvass for a presidential election had begun, with whig and democratic candidates, in addition to whom were soon brought forward the candidates of a free-soil party, so called from its insisting upon the exclusion of slavery from the recently acquired territories. All the signs of the time pointed to a wide and a grave division between northern and southern opinions. It was a more serious strife than that between the United States and Mexico, from which, directly speaking, it had sprung.

Old questions subsiding. Old questions were subsiding. The tariff, twice revised within the last few years, (1842, 1846,) had been framed in such a way as to determine the abandonment of the protective system. Former differences with regard to the tenure and the sale of the public lands were put to rest, at least for the time. The system of internal improvements, long vexed and still undecided as to points of detail, was settled on general principles, establishing the policy of national though not of local enterprises at the charge of the federal government. Financial difficulties were also adjusted. The country acquiesced in renouncing a national bank and in supporting a national treasury.

Though the public debt was largely increased by the expenses of the Mexican war, it occasioned no burdens, no altercations; there was no division as to its management, no doubt as to its ultimate payment. All these questions had ceased to excite, if not to interest the nation.

Organization of old territory.

Nor was there any substantial difference upon the organization of the old territories. Wisconsin came in quietly as a state, (May 29, 1848.) Oregon was established as a territory, with some debate upon the exclusion of slavery; but in this the south as well as the north were of much the same mind, the line of the Missouri Compromise being held to extend to the Pacific. A trouble of quite a different sort broke out in connection with Oregon; the Indians of that territory taking up arms, to the great peril of its settlers, in the year of its organization, (1848.) The next year another territory was peaceably organized in Minnesota, (1849.)

Organization of new territory.

The more tranquil the nation on these points, the more irritable it seemed to be upon the points relating to the recent conquests. California and New Mexico required to be organized. The boundary between New Mexico and Texas, a subject on which Texan claims were very extensive, needed to be defined. Relations with the Indian tribes in all the new territory also demanded attention. Yet there was no such thing as deciding any of these matters while they were enveloped in the mists of the slavery question.

Slavery question.

This question had never assumed vaster proportions. The annexation of Texas, followed up by the war with Mexico, had been regarded, all over the country, as committing the nation, more decisively than ever before, to the support of slavery. The reasons for this view, whether well founded or not, stirred up the northern sentiment to undo what had been done, at the same time

that the southern feeling was equally aroused in carrying out the measures which had been begun. The idea at the north was this: that the south had gained, in Texas, an immense accession of strength, to which no addition was to be made, nay, from which, if possible, something was to be taken, either by the curtailment of the Texan boundary, or by preventing the entire Texan territory from being peopled by slaveholders; at all events, New Mexico and California must be free. From the south, on the other hand, there came the demand, first, that Texas must be respected, and, next, that the other territories, acquired even more by southern exertions than by northern, must be left at liberty to choose whether they would or would not hold slaves. It was beginning to be known that neither California nor New Mexico was likely to be slaveholding. But this did not diminish the irritation in respect to them. The south was naturally disappointed that acquisitions from which they had looked for encouragement to their peculiar interests did not preserve the original look of promise; while the north, for the same cause, as naturally indulged in a certain exultation. This exultation on one side, and this disappointment on the other, fomented the strife between the contending parties.

Convention of southern members of Congress.

Congress showed a disposition to more decided action against slavery than it had ever done before. Instead of confining themselves to the organization of the territories, some members suggested the abolition of the slave trade, others that of slavery itself, in the District of Columbia. Alarmed by these demonstrations, the southern members met in convention, (December 23,) and appointed a committee to report upon certain resolutions in relation to the existing difficulties. Calhoun, still a senator, laid an address of the southern delegates to their constituents before an adjourned meeting of the convention,

(January 15, 1849.) The document inveighed against the aggressions of the north, particularly its evasion of the fugitive slave law, and its abolitionism. "We ask not," was the language of the address, "as the north alleges we do, for the extension of slavery. That would make a discrimination in our favor as unjust and unconstitutional as the discrimination they ask against us in their favor. . . . What, then, we do insist on is, not to extend slavery, but that we shall not be prohibited from immigrating with our property into the territories of the United States because we are slaveholders." In conclusion, an earnest appeal was made to the south to be united. John M. Berrien, a senator from Georgia, proposed an address to the people of the United States instead of one to the south alone; but the original address was adopted, (January 22.) Congress, meantime sat by, proposing and discussing much, but doing nothing beyond extending the revenue laws to California.

The territories declare against slavery.

The whigs had elected the new president, who soon appeared in the person of the successful general, Zachary Taylor, (March.) He took the only step in his power towards organizing the new territories, by instructing the officers stationed in them to encourage the people to organize themselves. The first to adopt his recommendations were the people of Deseret, the western part of California, since called Utah, where a number of Mormons had established their settlements. Next came the settlers of Sante Fe county, in New Mexico. But the only regular organization was that of the Californians, who met in convention and adopted a state constitution, (September, October, 1849.) Every one of these territories went against slavery, California expressly prohibiting it in her constitution. The north became exultant, the south defiant, as the issue of the strife drew nigh.

Congress met again, to be agitated from the very begin-

Clay suggests compromise.

ning of the session. Three weeks elapsed before the House of Representatives could even choose their speaker, (December.) Very soon afterwards, Senator Foote, of Mississippi, introduced a bill for the organization of the territories, (January 16, 1850.) This was followed by a series of resolutions proposed by Henry Clay, leader in the Missouri and the tariff compromises, and now urging a new compromise upon the present difficulties. Disappointed as he had been in his political hopes, a candidate for the presidency for a quarter of a century, and though warmly, yet never successfully supported, the fervor of his ambition and of his patriotism had never died out. He came forward with proposals of concession on both the contending sides. The resolutions promised the north that the slave trade in the District of Columbia should be abolished, and on the other hand assured the south that slavery in the District should be maintained for the present; they pledged the north to the restitution of fugitive slaves, the south to the admission of California as a free state; while both north and south were to agree in organizing the territories, and in deciding the boundary between Texas and New Mexico, (January 29.) Weeks passed away in vain discussions. The suggestions of compromise pleased neither party, and neither laid aside its arms.

Webster in debate.

What had been discussed with comparatively little power now became the subject of grave and massive appeals. The extreme views of the south found vehement support, chiefly from Calhoun, who had led in the same cause for years. On the other side, the extreme views of the north were but faintly and feebly urged. The great leader of that section aspired to be the great leader of the country as a whole. "I speak," said Webster in the Senate Chamber, "not as a Massachusetts man, nor as a

northern man, but as an American, and a member of the Senate of the United States." "I speak," he added, "for the preservation of the Union." After adverting to the question of slavery in general, and deploring the vehemence with which it was supported at the south, Webster passed to the consideration of the territories. Texas, he averred, was a slave state by the terms of annexation; New Mexico and California, on the other hand, were to be free states, both by the will of their inhabitants and by the nature of their climates and their soils. "The whole territory within the former United States," said Webster, "or in the newly-acquired Mexican provinces, has a fixed and settled character, now fixed and settled by law which cannot be repealed; in the case of Texas, without a violation of the public faith, and by no human power in regard to California or New Mexico." It was useless, therefore, and worse than useless, he argued, to be wrangling about provisos of Congress to admit or to prohibit slavery. Recurring to the subject of slavery, especially to that in the District of Columbia, and to the provisions of the law concerning fugitive slaves, Webster deprecated the denunciations and the menaces of the north as earnestly as he did the passionate ideas of the south. Men differ as to their estimate of the compromise, but none doubt the influence of Webster in promoting its adoption. From the day that he spoke as has been described, (March 7,) the compromise was secure.

Report of compromise.

But not without continued bitterness in both branches of Congress. The Senate finally appointed a committee of thirteen, Clay being chairman, by whom the compromise of 1850, as it is styled, was reported in three bills. The first admitted California as a state, organized New Mexico and Utah as territories without any provision for or against slavery, and arranged the disputed boundary between New Mexico and Texas by a large indemnity to the latter. The second provided for the

recovery of fugitive slaves. The third abolished the slave trade in the District of Columbia. The report of the compromise (May 8) was instantly followed by the most impassioned debates. It seemed as if there could be no conciliation between parties so diverse and so inflamed.

Its adoption. At the height of the controversy, President Taylor sickened and died, (July 9.) He was succeeded by the vice president, Millard Fillmore, who called about him a new cabinet, Webster at the head, and threw the whole weight of the administration in favor of the compromise. It was at first rejected. But, on the substitution of separate bills for each of the measures proposed, they were successively adopted by both houses. California was admitted a state; New Mexico and Utah were constituted territories, and the payment of ten millions to Texas, on consideration of the boundary and other questions, was voted; all on the same day, (September 9.) Nine days after, the fugitive slave bill became a law, (September 18;) and two days later still, the slave trade in the District of Columbia was suppressed, (September 20.) So ended, as far as legislation was concerned, a strife begun with the proviso of David Wilmot, more than four years before, and kept up during the whole of the intervening period, in Congress and throughout the nation.

Continued controversy. It did not yet cease. The president met Congress at the close of the year with the assurance that "we have been rescued from the wide and boundless agitation that surrounded us, and have a firm, distinct, and legal ground to rest upon." Yet, on the floor of Congress, in all public places, at the tribunal and in the pulpit, as well as in private, around the table and at the hearth, the nation was disputing both about the points disposed of and about the manner in which they had been disposed. Unlike the compromises of earlier years, the compromise of 1850 did not bring peace.

CHAPTER X.

National Development.

Development of territory.

The accession to the national territory following the annexation of Texas and the war with Mexico has been described. Vast as it was, it was much less than the increase which had already taken place. At the close of the revolution, the United States, not then extending to the Mississippi, embraced upwards of eight hundred thousand square miles. There were nearly four times as many, or upwards of twenty-nine hundred thousand, at the period which we have reached. Of the twenty-one hundred thousand thus added to the original eight, nearly nine came with Louisiana, (1803,) nearly one with Florida, (1819,) more than three with Oregon, (1846,) making thirteen, in addition to which were the three of Texas, (1845,) and the five of Mexico, (1848.)

Of population.

The increase of population was still more remarkable. It did not spring from the extension of territory. All the twenty-one hundred thousand square miles, just mentioned, contained not two hundred thousand whites, even including the natives of the United States, who, as in Texas and Oregon, were but brought back to the fold of the nation. Yet the numbers of the United States had now swelled to upwards of twenty-three millions from the three millions at the end of the revolutionary period. Of the twenty-three millions, three were slaves, or five times as many as there were in 1783. The free population was

not merely five times, but eight times as numerous; twenty-four hundred thousand in 1783, and in 1850, full twenty millions. Of this great number, less than an eighth were of foreign birth, but of the other seven-eighths and more, a large number were children of foreign born parents. Immigration had added immensely to the population, especially in the last quarter of a century. In ten years of the preceding century, (1790–1800,) there were but fifty thousand arrivals; in one year of the present period, (1849–1850,) there were two hundred and eighty thousand. In summing up the population, we must add to the twenty-three millions, already stated, about four hundred thousand as the number of the Indians within the country. Rather less than half of these were dwellers in the more recently acquired territories; rather less than a fourth probably were the descendants of those in the United States just after the revolution. To the east of the Mississippi, none but a few scattered families of the aboriginal race remained.

Of occupation. With such an expansion in population, and in territory, there was of necessity an expansion in occupation. Old pursuits were embraced by greater numbers, and followed out with greater resources to greater results. Such inventions as Eli Whitney's cotton gin, to separate cotton from the seed, (1793,) or Cyrus H. McCormick's reaper, to gather in a crop, (1847,) in ways no manual labor could compete with, enlarged the sphere of agricultural production. The earliest cotton mills were those of Rhode Island, (1790,) the earliest woollen, in which the power loom was used, were those of Massachusetts, (1807;) the beginnings of the manufactures that became a great political as well as industrial interest at a later time. The chief occupation of the early time was still chief; out of six millions free males above fifteen years old, two millions and a half were now engaged in agriculture and its kindred

labors. To this number must be added the larger proportion of the nearly one million slave males above fifteen, employed in the same way. Next to agriculture came the trades and the manufactures, employing not far from two millions. A million and a half remained for other occupations, including those of commerce, which, like agriculture and manufacture, was greatly extended beyond its former limits. Of the class set down as professional or educational, the numbers were estimated at from two to three hundred thousand; an immense increase, compared with the numbers of the past. New pursuits blended in with the old. There was a constant trial of means as yet untried, a constant striving after ends as yet unattained. Inventions multiplied, labors expanded; and not in any one direction, but on all sides.

Of investments.

Increased toils led to increased returns, and these to increased investments in the various branches of industry. To measure the investments by the annual results, we find the products of agriculture for a single year estimated at thirteen hundred millions of dollars. The total return for trades and manufactures was ten hundred millions. Commercial statistics exhibit imports to the value of above one hundred and seventy-five, and exports to that of above one hundred and fifty millions. Such figures are confusing from their very vastness. Nor are they altogether safe as indications of the actual capital in the country. No people ever trusted so little to capital and so much to credit, as the growing nation of the United States.

Of communications.

To make the resources and the exertions of the nation effective, there had come into use new methods of communication. The early canals, of little extent or importance, were followed by a series of very remarkable works, foremost amongst which were the Erie Canal of New York, (1825,) and the Ohio Canal from Lake

Erie to the Ohio, (1832.) The first steamboat, the Clermont, the work of Robert Fulton, appeared upon the Hudson in 1807. After a long interval, the passage of the Atlantic was made by the Savannah steamer, (1819.) First of our railways was the Quincy in Massachusetts, a single track of between three and four miles, to transport granite from a quarry to the water's edge, (1827.) The first locomotive was used upon the Hudson and Mohawk Railroad, (1832.) More recently, the invention of the electric telegraph, first constructed between Washington and Baltimore, by Samuel F. B. Morse, (1844,) completed the means of communication. At the close of the period, there were in operation twenty thousand miles of telegraphic wires, sixteen thousand of railways, four thousand five hundred of canals, to say nothing of the countless spaces traversed by the steamers of our rivers, our lakes, and our seas.

Of education. So much physical development was not unattended by development of a higher sort. The system of public schools had extended from the places where the first were founded throughout most, but not all of the country. A national provision for their support in the new states of the west and the south was made by the appropriation of lands in every township of the public domain; a total of nearly fifty millions of acres being thus divided amongst the states and territories. Of the older states, the larger number had their school funds devoted to the same great object. The number of schools grew to be nearly one hundred thousand; that of their teachers was about the same. Private schools and colleges kept pace with the general increase; the former amounting to upwards of six thousand; the latter, including professional and scientific schools, to several hundred. Nor was it only in point of numbers that educational institutions were growing. They gave much better proof of progress in their studies and their

methods of instruction; not, indeed, that these reached the true standard of the scholar, but that they were much less remote from it than the schools and the colleges of older times.

National Institutions.

The nation had its institutions. A Military Academy, first suggested by Washington, was established at West Point, (1802.) A Naval Academy, recommended by John Quincy Adams, was opened long afterwards at Annapolis, (1845.) All the commendations of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and the second Adams, upon the subject of a national university, were fruitless. But much that would have been accomplished by such an institution was done at the offices of observation and of publication connected with the academies just mentioned, and with the various departments at Washington. A large bequest from James Smithson, of London, was received, and several years later, (1846,) applied by the United States, as the testator had directed, "to found at Washington, under the name of the Smithsonian Institution, an establishment for the increase and diffusion of knowledge amongst men."

Exploring Expedition.

One enterprise of the government for the advancement of knowledge is to be gratefully recorded. An Exploring Expedition, consisting of several vessels under the command of Lieutenant Charles Wilkes, attached to whom was a body of scientific men, sailed (1838) on an extended cruise through the Antarctic and Pacific Oceans. The chief discovery of the expedition was that supposed to have been made of an antarctic continent; but this was not entirely confirmed. More certain, therefore, were the results derived from the precise investigations of sea and shore, including races and productions, wherever the explorers passed. A voyage of nearly four years ended with honor to them, and advantage not only to their country, but to the world, (1842.)

The press. Activity was nowhere more marked than in the press. Where a few movements, sluggish in themselves, and broken by interference from without, had been perceptible, there now prevailed an activity only too restless. The department of newspapers was become perhaps the busiest of all. The enterprise of their publishers and their editors was something remarkable even in the land of enterprise; nor was that of their readers less remarkable, one may say, considering the number of papers required to satisfy an individual. The number of newspapers — thirty-five at the beginning of the revolution — amounted at last to between twenty-five hundred and three thousand. It might be supposed that other publications would suffer; but not so. Almost as many books as journals issued from the press, some foreign, others original publications, on every sort of subject, and in every sort of form. Amongst the most characteristic as well as the most serviceable inventions of the time was that of a printing press by which thousands of impressions could be taken in an hour; the inventor was Richard M. Hoe, (1847.) Other contrivances added to the facility of printing, so much so, that what was a work of years, the century before, was now the work only of days. In all this multiplication of methods and of results, good and evil were necessarily blended. The number of publications proves development in one way; but whether there was development in another and a higher way, depended on their character. Every one knows how various this was, how various it is still.

Libraries. Publications increasing, libraries increased. The scanty repositories of a hundred years previous were augmented or succeeded by far more numerous and far more valuable collections. Private libraries became comparatively general; public ones comparatively universal. From the university collection of thousands down to the Sunday

school case of fifty or a hundred volumes, the number of public libraries is estimated to have been more than fifteen thousand. Of course, there was the utmost diversity in point of importance; some libraries, enumerated in the list, being totally undeserving of the name. None, not even the largest, compared with the great libraries of Europe, where books had been accumulating for centuries, and where ample endowments kept up the increase year by year. Nor, to speak generally, did the character of our libraries correspond with that of an equally large number of books in a European collection; ours being too often filled by purchases or by donations made at random. A new era in American libraries began not so much with the foundation, as with the formation of the Astor Library in New York, at the very close of the period comprehended in this volume. The collection of books commenced there for the benefit alike of the most contemplative and the most practical student, rather than of the mere reader, may well serve as an example to the nation.

Literature: political.

One branch of the national literature has been touched upon and quoted from in the preceding pages. The political writings of the time, constitutional and administrative, belong too much to the world of action to be viewed merely as works of thought. Few of them, indeed, bear marks of lofty contemplation, or of abstract reasoning; the greater number, absorbed in fleeting circumstances, show little sensibility to the broad relations and the enduring principles of government. Such productions as those of Webster and Calhoun are rare exceptions. If we see the dust of the day's strife upon them, it does not lie thickly enough to obscure the solemnity or the brilliancy, as the case may be, of the cause for which they plead.

Theological.

Theological literature maintained its hold; and more naturally now that it comprehended the

writings of various churches, instead of being confined to the one or two of the colonial period. Chief amongst the successors of the early churchmen was John Henry Hobart, Bishop of New York, in whom earnestness and learning were remarkably combined. At the head of those succeeding the early Puritans were Moses Stuart and William Ellery Channing, the former the leader of the old school, the latter of the new or liberal one. Both were men of great research and of great power. Both went beyond the limits of theological writings, especially Channing, whose works on education and on the great interests of humanity are more likely to endure than those upon points of theology. The Presbyterians had their expositor in Archibald Alexander, the Methodists theirs in Stephen Olin. Amongst the Roman Catholics, the principal theologian was John England, Bishop of Charleston.

Legal. Allied by its gravity to the productions that have been mentioned was the legal literature of the period. The laws of the United States were expounded by James Kent and Joseph Story; those of nations by Henry Wheaton. Of the large number distinguished in one walk or another of jurisprudence, Edward Livingston, the author of a system of a penal code for the State of Louisiana, and subsequently of a system of penal laws for the United States, and Hugh Swinton Legaré, not so much a writer as a jurist, were both eminent.

Historical. Omitting the works of the living, little remains to constitute a historical literature during the period. Jeremy Belknap's History of New Hampshire and Abiel Holmes's American Annals are the only productions that merit especial mention. Both appeared near the beginning of the period; a long interval elapsed without producing any histories worthy of the name.

Scientific works were more numerous. John Picker-

Scientific. ing and Albert Gallatin took the lead in philology, particularly in the Indian languages; both being eminent for other studies. Alexander Wilson, a Scotchman by birth, published an American Ornithology, afterwards continued by another foreigner, Charles Lucien Bonaparte. John James Audubon, born in Louisiana long before its acquisition by the United States, was the author of the Birds of America, and subsequently, in conjunction with his sons, of the Quadrupeds of America. Higher than any other name of the time in science, stands that of Nathaniel Bowditch, the translator and the commentator of the *Mécanique Céleste* of Laplace, the great astronomer and mathematician of France.

Belles lettres. While such were the graver studies of men, others of a lighter character were not neglected. In the cultivation of the belles lettres, a growing number was interested. Touching, we may say, are the accounts of the associations formed at the opening of the period, to fan the few sparks of general scholarship that then existed. Soon individuals appeared, some collecting, others composing books upon the subjects that they loved. A more graceful aspect was thus given to the intellectual pursuits of the nation. Towards the close of the period we find Richard Henry Wilde, a native of Dublin, devoting his fine powers to the memory of the Italian poets, while the English authors, Shakespeare and Wordsworth especially, received the tributes offered them by the pure taste and the pure heart of Henry Reed.

Fiction. Fiction had its votaries. Charles Brockden Brown began upon his romances at the close of the eighteenth century. He dealt with unnatural occurrences and exaggerated emotions, — the groper, as it were, into the realms which no one of his nation had entered before him. Twenty years later, James Fenimore Cooper

brought out the earliest of that remarkable series of novels in which the Indian character was portrayed. He then turned to the sea, describing its wonders and its heroes. Not his own country alone, but other countries, welcomed the master, the first of all Americans to be acknowledged such in the world of imagination. A later novelist, and one of a very different mould, appeared in William Ware, whose Letters from Palmyra, or Zenobia, transported the reader from the freshness of the present to the decaying grandeurs of antiquity.

The drama. James A. Hillhouse was the ideal dramatist, John Howard Payne the real. The former wrote his Percy's Masque from an English ballad, his Hadad from scriptural associations; the latter sought the materials of his Brutus and his Clari amidst the copies and the tinsels of the stage. Hillhouse deserves the name of poet. He was one of the first, the very first, of the present period to form a drama as one would form a poem, lofty and serene. The staple literature of the drama was like Payne's productions, fit for the glare of the theatre, and fit for that alone.

Poetry. Poetry was beginning to find a place in American literature. Maria Brooks, the impassioned author of Zophiel, was a very different creature from the poets or poetesses of colonial times. Quite as imaginative, and far more delicate, was the fancy of Joseph Rodman Drake, who died so young that the poems he left were but the signs of what he might have done. A longer life was given to James Gates Percival, whose occasional pieces are full of rhythmic inspiration. Above them all, in point of purity and of devotion, if not of imagination, was William Croswell. His poems are but the flowers dropped along the path of priestly offices. Yet had they, and not the offices, been his work of works, he would not have lived in vain. Almost the same words may be written of Andrews

Norton, whose little cluster of hymns will move many and many a heart beyond the reach of the theological and critical compositions in which he spent his days.

Art. In art, likewise, the nation was rousing itself. Gilbert Stuart was the great portrait painter of his day. John Trumbull, if not a great historical painter, was more than equal to the majority then engaged in that branch of art. Then came Washington Allston, at once the historical and the portrait painter, the landscape and the ideal artist, in whom sublimity and delicacy, the grandeur of spirit and the accuracy of detail, all found expression. It seemed as if it must have been some other land than ours, so material, so absorbed in the interests and in the strifes of outward life, that gave Allston being. But he came; and after him there has come a line of painters and sculptors who look back to Allston as to their leader and their head. Of these, it becomes us to mention only the departed. But the names of Thomas Cole, the painter, a native of England, and of Horatio Greenough, the sculptor, are such as to stand with honor for the living as well as for the dead.

Religious development. Of the religious development of the nation it is difficult to take any suitable notice in limits so confined as these. From one point of view, that of the strict schools, — no matter to what church they belonged, — there was a retrocession rather than an advance in religious interests. From the opposite point of view — that of the liberal schools — the advance was pronounced incomparable and irresistible. Between these contradictory opinions the truth lay. Religion was not more widely or more truly, but more mildly, professed. Its followers, with few exceptions, had put off their armor. Persecution, it is true, was not wholly abandoned; if it did not wear its ancient forms, it came forth from time to time in unmistakable reality, some-

times on religious, sometimes on political or on social grounds. But there was no longer the same strife that there had been amongst creeds and forms. The very multiplicity of these was enough to distract the champions who would fain do violence in behalf of their own cause. So many, indeed, were the adversaries outside of any single church, that men turned against one another on the inside, the bitterest contentions arising between different parties within the same fold. In point of mere names and numbers, the churches of the early time retained much the same relative position in the later period. If any had altered in this respect, it was the Roman Catholics, to whom large accessions had been made by immigration; but they still formed a small proportion of the mass of Christians. On the Protestant side, the Protestant Episcopal church resumed its earlier station between the Roman Catholics and other denominations. Amongst the later additions to the sects was the Mormon community, which, after various migrations, settled in Utah Territory, (1847.)

Charities.

No clearer proof of the national development, both spiritual and physical, could appear than in the charities of the time. The extent to which these were carried, especially towards the close of the period, shows all the increase of resources, all the expansion of principles, that had come to pass. The sums expended by the state and town authorities for the support of paupers alone amounted to three million dollars by the year. To this must be added the much larger sums devoted by associations and by individuals for the relief of almost every form of want and of crime. All this was the more generously expended in being expended to a great degree for the benefit of foreigners, who constituted a large portion of the wretched, and by far the largest portion of the wretched of the lowest order. Besides the succor thus given to the

most pressing necessities, the circle of charity embraced many enterprises of a higher character. The insane, first cared for in the Lunatic Asylum of Williamsburg, Virginia, (1773,) became the objects of charitable action throughout the country. The Friends' Lunatic Asylum was opened near Philadelphia, (1817;*) the American Asylum for the Deaf and Dumb in Hartford, (1817;) the Perkins Institution and Massachusetts Asylum for the Blind in Boston, (1832;) the Massachusetts School for Idiotic and Feeble-minded Youth, also in Boston, (1848;) all these being pioneers in labors greatly extended afterwards. Another class of charities is represented by the associations for the improvement of prisons and the reformation of prisoners; the Philadelphia societies (1776–87) leading the way. In this connection may be mentioned the abolition of imprisonment for debt, begun upon by Congress at an early date, (1792,) and afterwards generally carried out by state legislation. Religious and missionary bodies were also active in the cause of charity. The Pennsylvania Bible Society (1808) and the American Board of Foreign Missions (1810) were followed by a long line of associations intent upon saving the souls of men.

Conclusion: the past and the present.

Remembering all that has gone before, the feebleness, the strife, the continued errors of the earlier era, we shall not be likely to fall into the vein of overvaluing it, or of undervaluing the succeeding era. Nor, on the other hand, remembering the later events of our history, shall we imagine that the present puts the past to shame. Both periods have their virtues; both their vices. If the past is to be regretted, it is only because its

* Lunatics were received in the Pennsylvania Hospital from 1752.

power to do evil was less; if the present bears away the palm, it is only because its power to do good is greater; the increased resources and the increased responsibilities of the later period constituting the real distinction between it and the earlier. It is the distinction between every preceding and every succeeding epoch, the only true progress of humanity.

Part of the nation in human history.

The same truth will help us to estimate the part of the nation in human history, that is, its relation to other nations and to the common destinies of mankind. We are not to suppose the United States in the front of the universe, nor, on the contrary, place them in the rear, simply because they are young and free. Youth implies both vigor and immaturity, and when a nation possesses not only youth but freedom, the certainty of its being both vigorous and immature is confirmed. Such is our position; we are strong, but we are unformed. If we are younger than other countries, it is not altogether to our advantage; there may be the more for us to learn and to do before we become a complete nation. So, too, in being freer than other nations, we are exposed to dangers from which they are sheltered by their very bondage. The tendencies to lawlessness and to disunion are written in men's actions all around us. They must be met, checked, and subdued, before our republic is safe in itself or noble in the eyes of the stranger. On both grounds, therefore, — on that of youth and that of freedom, — we are under responsibilities that sometimes seem greater than the accompanying privileges. At the same time, there is no doubt that we are the gainers by coming late and by coming free upon the stage of history. We have been animated by the greatness, warned by the weakness, of earlier times. Their burdens are not upon our shoulders, their bonds are not upon our limbs; what has been is not perpetually clashing with

what is, or with what ought to be. Great, indeed, are our lessons, and great our resources; great, therefore, should be our deeds. If they are not so, our rank, historically, sinks to insignificance. But if they are, if the deeds bear full proportion to the resources and the lessons, then, and then only, the part of the nation in human history will rise to majesty.

APPENDIX.

I.

EUROPEAN SOVEREIGNS,

AT ANY TIME RULING, OR CLAIMING RULE, OVER ANY PART OF THE PRESENT UNITED STATES.

SPAIN.

1492. Ferdinand and Isabella.
1504. Ferdinand, Philip, and Joanna.
1516. Charles I., (the Fifth of Germany.)
1556. Philip II.
1598. Philip III.
1621. Philip IV.
1665. Charles II.
1700. Philip V.
1746. Ferdinand VI.
1759. Charles III.
1788. Charles IV.
1808. Joseph Napoleon.
1814. Ferdinand VII.

FRANCE.

1515. Francis I.
1547. Henry II.
1559. Francis II.
1560. Charles IX.
1574. Henry III.
1589. Henry IV.
1610. Louis XIII.
1643. Louis XIV.
1715. Louis XV.
1774. Louis XVI.
[1792. Revolution.]
1804. Napoleon.

ENGLAND.

1492. Henry VII.
1509. Henry VIII.
1547. Edward VI.
1553. Mary.
1558. Elizabeth.
1603. James I.
1625. Charles I.
[1649. Commonwealth.]
1660. Charles II.
1685. James II.
1689. William and Mary.
1702. Anne.
1714. George I.
1727. George II.
1760. George III.

HOLLAND.

Stadtholders and Captains General.

1584. Maurice of Orange.
1625. Frederic Henry.
1647. William II.
[1650. Commonwealth.]
1674. William III.

SWEDEN.

1609. Gustavus Adolphus.
1632. Christina.

II.

AMERICAN AUTHORITIES.

I. Presidents of the Continental Congress.

1774.	Peyton Randolph,	of Virginia.
	Henry Middleton,	" South Carolina.
1775.	Peyton Randolph.	
	John Hancock,	" Massachusetts.
1777.	Henry Laurens,	" South Carolina.
1778.	John Jay,	" New York.
1779.	Samuel Huntington,	" Connecticut.
1781.	Thomas McKean,	" Delaware.
	John Hanson,	" Maryland.
1782.	Elias Boudinot,	" New Jersey.
1783.	Thomas Mifflin,	" Pennsylvania.
1784.	Richard Henry Lee,	" Virginia.
1786.	Nathaniel Gorham,	" Massachusetts.
1787.	Arthur St. Clair,	" Pennsylvania.
1788.	Cyrus Griffin,	" Virginia.

II. National Administrations.

1. 1789–97.

President.

George Washington.

Vice President.

John Adams.

Secretaries of State.

1789. Thomas Jefferson.
1794. Edmund Randolph.
1795. Timothy Pickering.

Secretaries of the Treasury.

1789. Alexander Hamilton.
1795. Oliver Wolcott

Secretaries of War.

1789. Henry Knox.
1795. Timothy Pickering.
1796. James McHenry.

Postmasters General.

1789. Samuel Osgood.
1794. Timothy Pickering.
1795. Joseph Habersham.

Attorneys General.

1789. Edmund Randolph.
1794. William Bradford.
1795. Charles Lee.

Chief Justices.

1789. John Jay.
1795. John Rutledge.
1796. William Cushing.
Oliver Ellsworth.

Speakers of the House of Representatives.

1789. Frederic A. Muhlenberg.
1791. Jonathan Trumbull.
1793. Frederic A. Muhlenberg.
1795. Jonathan Dayton.

2. 1797–1801.

President.

John Adams.

Vice President.

Thomas Jefferson.

Secretaries of State.

Timothy Pickering.
1800. John Marshall.

Secretaries of the Treasury.

Oliver Wolcott.
1800. Samuel Dexter.

Secretaries of War.

James McHenry.
1800. Samuel Dexter.
1801. Roger Griswold.

Secretary of the Navy.

1798. Benjamin Stoddert.

Postmaster General.

Joseph Habersham.

Attorney General.

Charles Lee.

Chief Justices.

Oliver Ellsworth.
1801. John Marshall.

Speakers of the House of Representatives.

Jonathan Dayton.
1799. Theodore Sedgwick.

3. 1801–09.

President.

Thomas Jefferson.

Vice Presidents.

1801. Aaron Burr.
1805. George Clinton.

Secretary of State.

1801. James Madison.

Secretaries of the Treasury.

Samuel Dexter.
1802. Albert Gallatin.

Secretary of War.

1801. Henry Dearborn.

Secretaries of the Navy.

Benjamin Stoddert.
1802. Robert Smith.
1805. Jacob Crowninshield.

Postmasters General.

Joseph Habersham.
1802. Gideon Granger.

Attorneys General.

1801. Levi Lincoln.
1805. Robert Smith.
1806. John Breckenridge.
1807. Cæsar A. Rodney.

Chief Justice.

John Marshall.

Speakers of the House of Representatives.

1801. Nathaniel Macon.
1807. Joseph B. Varnum.

4. 1809–17.

President.

James Madison.

Vice Presidents.

1809. George Clinton.
1813. Elbridge Gerry.

Secretaries of State.

1809. Robert Smith.
1811. James Monroe.

Secretaries of the Treasury.

Albert Gallatin.
1814. George W. Campbell.
Alexander J. Dallas.

Secretaries of War.

1809. William Eustis.
1813. John Armstrong.
1814. James Monroe.
1815. William H. Crawford.

Secretaries of the Navy.

1809. Paul Hamilton.
1813. William Jones.
1814. Benj. W. Crowninshield.

Postmasters General.

Gideon Granger.
1814. Return J. Meigs.

Attorneys General.

Cæsar A. Rodney.
1811. William Pinkney.
1814. Richard Rush.

Chief Justice.

John Marshall.

Speakers of the House of Representatives.

Joseph B. Varnum
1811. Henry Clay.
1813. Langdon Cheves.
1815. Henry Clay.

5. 1817–25.

President.

James Monroe.

Vice President.

Daniel D. Tompkins.

Secretary of State.

1817. John Q. Adams.

Secretary of the Treasury.

1817. William H. Crawford.

Secretary of War.

1817. John C. Calhoun.

Secretaries of the Navy.

Benj. W. Crowninshield.
1818. Smith Thompson.
1823. Samuel L. Southard.

Postmasters General.

Return J. Meigs.
1823. John McLean.

Attorneys General.

Richard Rush.
1817. William Wirt.

Chief Justice.

John Marshall.

Speakers of the House of Representatives.

Henry Clay.
1820. John W. Taylor.
1821. Philip P. Barbour
1823. Henry Clay.

6. 1825–29.

President.

John Quincy Adams.

Vice President.

John C. Calhoun.

Secretary of State.

1825. Henry Clay.

Secretary of the Treasury.

1825. Richard Rush.

Secretaries of War.

1825. James Barbour.
1828. Peter B. Porter.

Secretary of the Navy.

Samuel L. Southard.

Postmaster General.

John McLean.

Attorney General.

William Wirt.

Chief Justice.

John Marshall.

Speakers of the House of Representatives.

1825. John W. Taylor.
1827. Andrew Stevenson.

7. 1829–37.

President.

Andrew Jackson.

Vice Presidents.

1829. John C. Calhoun.
1833. Martin Van Buren.

Secretaries of State.

1829. Martin Van Buren.
1831. Edward Livingston.
1833. Louis McLane.
1834. John Forsyth.

Secretaries of the Treasury.

1829. Samuel D. Ingham.
1831. Louis McLane.
1833. William J. Duane.
Roger B. Taney.
1834. Levi Woodbury.

Secretaries of War.

1829. John H. Eaton.
1831. Lewis Cass.

Secretaries of the Navy.

1829. John Branch.
1831. Levi Woodbury.
1834. Mahlon Dickerson.

Postmasters General.

1829. William T. Barry.
1835. Amos Kendall.

Attorneys General.

1829. John M. Berrien.
1831. Roger B. Taney.
1834. Benjamin F. Butler.

Chief Justices.

John Marshall.
1836. Roger B. Taney.

Speakers of the House of Representatives.

Andrew Stevenson.
1834. John Bell.
1835. James K. Polk.

8. 1837–41.

President.

Martin Van Buren.

Vice President.

Richard M. Johnson.

Secretary of State.

John Forsyth.

Secretary of the Treasury.

Levi Woodbury.

Secretary of War.

1837. Joel R. Poinsett.

Secretaries of the Navy.

Mahlon Dickerson.
1838. James K. Paulding.

Postmasters General.

Amos Kendall.
1840. John M. Niles.

Attorneys General.

Benjamin F. Butler.
1838. Felix Grundy.
1840. Henry D. Gilpin.

Chief Justice.

Roger B. Taney.

Speakers of the House of Representatives.

James K. Polk.
1839. Robert M. T. Hunter.

9. 1841–45.

Presidents.

William Henry Harrison.
John Tyler.

Vice President.

John Tyler.

Secretaries of State.

1841. Daniel Webster.
1843. Hugh S. Legaré.
Abel P. Upshur.
1844. John C. Calhoun.

Secretaries of the Treasury.

1841. Thomas Ewing.
Walter Forward.
1843. John C. Spencer.
1844. George M. Bibb.

Secretaries of War.

1841. John Bell.
John C. Spencer.
1843. James M. Porter.
1844. William Wilkins.

Secretaries of the Navy.

1841. George E. Badger.
Abel P. Upshur.
1843. David Henshaw.
1844. Thomas W. Gilmer
John Y. Mason.

Postmasters General.

1841. Francis Granger.
Charles A. Wickliffe.

Attorneys General.

1841. John J. Crittenden.
Hugh S. Legaré.
1843. John Nelson.

Chief Justice.

Roger B. Taney.

Speakers of the House of Representatives.

1841. John White.
1843. John W. Jones.

10. 1845–49.

President.

James Knox Polk.

Vice President.

George M. Dallas.

Secretary of State.

1845. James Buchanan.

Secretary of the Treasury.

1845. Robert J. Walker.

Secretary of War.

1845. William L. Marcy.

Secretaries of the Navy.

1845. George Bancroft.
1846. John Y. Mason.

Postmaster General.

1845. Cave Johnson.

Attorneys General.

1845. John Y. Mason.
1846. Nathan Clifford.
1848. Isaac Toucey.

Chief Justice.

Roger B. Taney.

Speakers of the House of Representatives.

1845. John W. Davis.
1847. Robert C. Winthrop.

11. 1849–50.

Presidents.

1849. Zachary Taylor.
1850. Millard Fillmore.

Vice President.

Millard Fillmore.

Secretaries of State.

1849. John M. Clayton.
1850. Daniel Webster.

Secretaries of the Treasury.

1849. William M. Meredith.
1850. Thomas Corwin.

Secretaries of War.

1849. George W. Crawford.
1850. Charles M. Conrad.

Secretaries of the Navy.

1849. William B. Preston.
1850. William A. Graham.

Secretaries of the Interior.

1849. Thomas Ewing.
1850. Alexander H. H. Stuart.

Postmasters General

1849. Jacob Collamer.
1850. Nathan K. Hall.

Attorneys General.

1849. Reverdy Johnson.
1850. John J. Crittenden.

Chief Justice.

Roger B. Taney.

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

1849. Howell Cobb.

INDEX.

Abenakis, 57.
—— wars with, 118–20.
Abolitionism, 166, 304, 408.
Acadie, 18, 19, 138, 142, 145, 149.
Acts of Parliament, 105, 174, 175, 186, 187, 193, 195, 198, 200, 201, 203, 208, 241.
Adams, John, 197, 203, 204, 222, 223, 240, 263, 276, 297, 307, 316, 325, 326, 331, 332.
Adams, John Quincy, 312, 375, 386, 390–93, 395.
Adams, Samuel, 199, 203.
Administrations, 468.
Admiralty, 169, 187.
Africans, 60.
Alabama, 141, 337, 382, 396, 402.
Alexandria Convention, 280.
Algonquins, 56, 57.
Alien act, 333.
Allston, Washington, 462.
America, discovered, 5, 9, 22.
—— named, 11.
American Association, 203, 207.
American system, 394.
Ames, Fisher, 321.
Andros, Sir Edmund, 107–109, 119, 145.
Annapolis Academy, 456.
Annapolis Convention, 280.
Arkansas, 382, 415, 425.
Armed neutrality, 254.
Army of the revolution, 210–212, 231, 238, 239, 258, 264, 265.
—— provisional, 332.
—— of the war with Great Britain, 357, 361, 367.
—— of the war with Mexico, 431, 435, 440.
Arnold, Benedict, 211, 216, 229, 252, 257, 260.
Art, in the colonies, 162, 163.
—— in the United States, 295, 462.
Assemblies, colonial, 190.
Astor Library, 458.
Audubon, J. J., 460.
Austin, Stephen F., 417, 418.

Bacon, Nathaniel, 106, 107.
Baltimore, 356.
—— defence of, 366.
Baltimore, Lords, 43, 78, 101.
Bank of North America, 273.
Bank of United States, 302, 368, 380, 405–408.
Banking, colonial, 174.
——national, 412.
Baptists, 92, 93, 127, 164.
Bartram, John and William, 162.
Belcher, Jonathan, 173.
Belknap, Jeremy, 291, 459.
Berkeley, Sir William, 106, 107, 159.
Berlin decree, 345.
Bibles, editions of, 160.
Billings, William, 295.
Bishops proposed, 110, 165.
—— appointed, 279.
Black Hawk, 409.
Bladensburg battle, 365.
Blair, James, 158.
Block, Adrian, 48.
Board of trade, 169.
Bonaparte, Charles L., 160.
Boston, 37, 168, 173, 175, 196, 198 200, 201.
—— siege of, 214, 218.
Bowditch, Nathaniel, 460.
Boyle, Robert, 114.
Bradford, William, 33, 34.
Bradstreet, Simon, 103, 108.
Brainerd, David, 123.
Brandywine battle, 235.
Bridgewater battle, 362.
Bromfield, Edward, 162.
Brooks, Maria, 461.
Brown, Charles B., 460.
Brown, General Jacob, 360, 362.
Buena Vista battle, 434.
Bunker Hill battle, 213.
Burgoyne's defeat, 234, 235.

Burke, Edmund, 208, 217.
Burnet, William, 172, 173.
Burr, Aaron, 341.

Cabot, John, 22.
—— Sebastian, 22, 23.
Calef, Robert, 96.
Calhoun, John C., 355, 392, 403, 426, 447, 449, 458.
California, 135, 435, 436, 442, 444, 446–451.
Calvert, Sir George, 27, 43.
Camden battle, 250.
Canada, 17, 19, 136, 138, 142, 154, 201, 216, 420.
Canals, 454.
Cancello, Luis de, 14.
Canonchet, 118, 119
Canonicus, 116.
Cape Ann colony, 36.
Capital, national, 301.
Carolana, 45, 78.
Carolina, 17, 78.
Caroline, burning of the, 420, 421.
Carver, John, 51.
Catesby, Mark, 163.
Central America, relations with, 389.
Cerro Gordo battle, 438.
Channing, William E., 416, 459.
Chapultepec battle, 439.
Charities, public, 463, 464.
Charleston, 79, 246, 250, 261.
—— defence of, 228.
Charter governments, 38, 88.
Charters assailed, 104, 108, 170.
Cherokees, 58, 393, 396.
—— wars with, 121.
Chesapeake, affair of, 343, 344.
Chickasaws, 58.
—— war with, 144.
Chihuahua conquered, 434, 435.
Child, Robert, and fellow petitioners, 91.
Chippewa battle, 362.
Church of England, 65, 91, 164, 279.
Churches in the colonies, 91, 164.
—— in the states, 279, 298.
Churubusco battle, 439.
Cincinnati Society, 269.
Clarke, John, and fellow Baptists, 92.
Classes in colonies, 85, 87.
Clay, Henry, 355, 375, 386, 387, 403, 407, 414, 449, 450.
Clayborne, William, 45.
Cole, Thomas, 462.
Coligny, Admiral de, 17.
Colleges, 29, 39, 158, 455.
Columbia Convention, 399.
Columbus, 7–11, 22.
Commercial rule over the colonies, 105, 174, 183.
Commissioners, British, to Massachusetts, 103.
—— to New York, 130.
—— to United States, 241.
Companies, Dutch, 48, 49, 127, 128.
—— English, 26, 27, 31, 42.
—— French, 136, 143.
—— Swedish, 54.
Compromises, constitutional, 287–290.
—— Missouri, 385, 386.
—— tariff, 403.
—— Texas, 426, 427.
—— of 1850, 449–451.
Conant, Roger, 36.
Concord battle, 209.
Conestoga massacre, 122.
Confederation, 225, 254.
Congress, stamp act, 188–191.
—— Continental, 202–204, 211, 212, 215, 221–225, 227, 231–233, 238–241, 244, 245, 251, 252, 254.
—— of the Confederation, 255, 258, 263–265, 270, 272, 274–276, 281, 293.
—— of the Constitution, 296, 299–305, 308, 318, 321, 323, 324, 337, 338, 346, 351, 353, 355, 367, 376, 382–388, 391, 394, 396–398, 402, 403, 405–407, 409–412, 414, 417, 420, 421, 427, 431, 447–451.
—— of Panama, 391.
Congresses, Provincial, 202, 206, 211, 212.
Connecticut, 40, 41, 76, 104, 108–110, 129, 210, 225, 275, 278, 369, 370, 382.
Consolidation of colonies, 107–110.
Constitution, national, 279–293.
—— amendments, 299
Constitutions, state, 225, 277, 278, 306, 382, 387, 422–425.
Contreras battle, 439.
Conventions, colonial, 167, 194, 201.
—— constitutional, 280, 282, 292, 293.
Cooper, J. Fenimore, 460.
Copley, John Singleton, 163.
Cornbury, Lord, 171.
Cornwallis's surrender, 259, 260.
Council for New England, 32, 35, 41.
Cowenga capitulation, 436.

Cowpens battle, 256.
Credit, public, 300, 416.
Creeks, 58, 392, 393.
—— wars with, 367, 380, 410.
Crisis of 1837, 412, 413.
Croswell, William, 461.
Crown, supremacy of, 102.
Crozat, Antoine, 141, 142.
Cruger, Henry, 207.

Dahcotas, 56.
Dare, Virginia, 24.
Dearborn, General Henry, 357, 360.
Debt, imprisonment for, 464.
—— public, 300, 301, 378, 408, 446.
Decatur, Captain Stephen, 364, 377.
Declaration of rights and liberties, 188, 189.
—— of colonial rights, 203.
—— of independence by Mecklenburg county, 210.
—— by Congress, 223, 224, 227.
Decrees, French, against American commerce, 317, 323, 331, 347, 348, 353.
D'Estaing, Count, 243, 244, 247.
De Grasse, Count, 259, 260.
De Kalb, Baron, 250.
Delaware, 82, 225, 281, 282, 292.
Delawares, 57.
—— wars with, 121, 122.
Democratic party, 411.
Democratic republicans, 308, 314.
Deposits in United States Bank removed, 406, 407.
Deseret, 448.
D'Iberville, Lemoine, 141, 146.
Dickinson, John, 193, 203, 222, 292.
Dictatorship of Washington, 232.
Doniphan, Colonel, 434, 435.
Dorr, Thomas W., 424, 425.
Drake, Sir Francis, 23, 24.
—— Joseph R., 461.
Dunster, Henry, 93.

Edwards, Jonathan, 123, 161.
Education, 157, 158.
Eliot, John, 40, 103, 113–115.
Embargo, under Washington, 318.
—— under Jefferson, 346, and substitutes, 347.
—— under Madison, 351, 367, 368.
Endicott, John, 36.
England, John, 159.
England, 65, 71–73, 179.
English dominion at its height in America, 177, 179.
Espejio, De, 15.
Europe, 3–5, 61–66.
European sovereigns, 467.
Eutaw Springs battle, 257.
Excise, 300, 308.
Exeter insurrection, 270.
Exploring Expedition, 456.

Federal and anti-federal, 284, 286.
Federal Convention, 282, 290.
Federal Republican, of Baltimore, 356.
Federalist and anti-federalist, 291, 302, 314, 318.
Federalist, the, 292.
Fillmore, Millard, 451.
Five Nations, 57, 120.
—— wars with, 144, 147, 148.
Fletcher, Benjamin, 109.
Florida, Spanish and British, 13, 14, 131, 132, 135, 263, 313, 336, 339, 350, 381.
—— American, 381, 416, 425.
Foot's resolution, 397, 398.
Foreign relations, 215, 240, 312, 379, 389, 410.
Foreigners, protection of, 376.
Fort Bowyer, 372, 373.
—— Brown, 433.
—— Erie, 362.
—— Lee, 229.
—— McHenry, 366.
—— Moultrie, 228.
—— Meigs, 359.
—— Mercer, 236, 237.
—— Mifflin, 236.
—— Stevenson, 359.
—— Sullivan, 228.
—— Washington, 229.
France, 64, 67–71.
—— alliance with, 240.
—— war with, 332.
—— relations with, 313–317, 322, 323, 331, 332, 334, 336, 338, 344, 345, 347, 348, 353, 358, 410, 411.
Franklin, Benjamin, 159, 160, 161, 168, 192, 202, 223, 240, 263, 283, 285, 287, 290.
Franklin, or Frankland, 271.
Free soil party, 445.
Fremont, John C., 435, 436.
Freneau, Philip, 294.
French in the revolution, 240, 243, 244, 252, 258–261.
Frenchtown battle, 358, 359.
Fugitive slaves, 86, 99, 289.
Fugitive slave laws, 448, 449, 451.

Gadsden, Christopher, 188, 203, 206.
Gage, General, 200, 206, 211.
Gallatin, Albert, 308, 355, 375, 460.
Gaspe revenue schooner, 197.
Gates, General Horatio, 234, 237, 238, 250.
General government for the colonies, 35, 36, 99, 107–110, 168, 170.
Genet's mission, 315, 316.
Georgia, 82, 133, 215, 225, 246, 277, 392, 393, 395, 396, 402.
Georgia controversy, 393.
Germantown battle, 235.
Gerry, Elbridge, 287, 290, 331, 378.
Gilbert, Sir Humphrey, 23, 24.
Godfrey, Thomas, 162.
Gorges, Sir Ferdinando, 31, 35, 36, 38, 74.
Gorton, Samuel, 98, 117.
Gosnold, Bartholomew, 25, 27.
Gourgues, De, 18.
Governors, royal, 106, 171.
Gray's voyage, 432.
Great Britain, relations with, 276, 313, 314, 317–320, 342–345, 347, 348, 351, 379, 420, 421, 431, 432. (See *Treaties, Wars.*)
Greene, General Nathaniel, 251, 256, 257, 259.
Greenough, Horatio, 462.
Grenville, Sir Richard, 24.
Guilford battle, 256.
Gun boats, Jefferson's, 346.

Hakluyt, Richard, 27.
Hamilton, Alexander, 239, 255, 279, 280, 283, 284, 292, 299, 300, 307, 308, 318, 335, 341.
Hanson, Alexander, 356.
Harrisburg Convention, 394.
Harrison, William Henry, 349, 358, 359, 421.
Hartford Convention, 369–372.
Harvard, John, 39.
Harvard College, 39, 93, 96, 194
Harvey, Reuben, 263.
Hawley, Joseph, 195, 204.
Hayne, Robert Y., 398.
Heckewelder, John, 311.
Henry, Patrick, 187, 203, 204.
Hillhouse, James A., 461.
Hobart, John H., 459.
Hobkirk's Hill battle, 256.
Hopkinson, Francis, 294.
Holmes, Abiel, 459.
Houston, Samuel, 418, 426.
Hudson, Henry, 47.
Huguenots in Carolina, 17, 18, 79.
Hull, Captain Isaac, 364.
Hull, General William, 358.
Hutchinson, Anne, 40.

Illinois, 139, 201, 242, 337, 341, 382, 415.
Immigration, 453.
Impressment, British, 175, 317, 342, 344, 353, 375, 376, 422.
Indented servants, 85, 86, 278.
Independence, American, idea of, 220, 221.
—— resolution of, 222, 223.
Independent treasury, 413, 414.
Indiana, 142, 275, 382, 415.
—— territory, 337.
Indians, tribes and numbers, 56–58, 453.
—— removal of, 349, 393. (See *Treaties, Wars.*)
Insolvency of states, 414, 415.
Iowa, 425.
Iroquois, 56, 57. (See *Five Nations.*)

Jackson, Andrew, 324, 367, 372, 373, 380, 381, 392, 395–397, 401, 402, 405–409, 411, 417, 419, 428.
Jay, John, 203, 221, 249, 263, 292, 299, 318–320.
Jay's treaty, 319–21.
Jefferson, Thomas, 223, 274, 276, 299, 305, 307, 308, 318, 326, 331, 333, 338, 339, 343, 346, 347, 384.
Jones, John Paul, 248, 249.
Judiciary, national, 299.
Judges, colonial, at king's pleasure, 176.

Kalm, Peter, 163.
Kent, James, 459.
Kentucky, 215, 271, 306.
King's Mountain battle, 253.
King's Province, 76, 104.

Laconia, 35.
Lafayette, Marquis de, 233, 241, 244, 249, 251, 259–261, 268, 277, 296, 325, 388.
Lake Champlain, action on, 363
—— Erie, action on, 359.
La Salle, 139, 140.
Laurens, Henry, 254, 263.
Law, English, in the colonies, 87.
Lee, General Charles, 228, 238, 241, 242.

Lee, General Henry, 309, 356.
—— Richard Henry, 203, 204, 222.
Legaré, Hugh Swinton, 459.
Leisler, Jacob, 108.
Leverett, John, 105, 119.
Lewis and Clarke's expedition, 432.
Lexington battle, 209.
Libraries, 457.
Ligonia, 74.
Lincoln, General Benjamin, 246, 247, 250, 270.
Little Belt, affair of, 350.
Literature of the colonies, 161, 162, 167.
—— of the United States, 291, 292, 294, 458–461.
Livingston, Edward, 459.
Livingston, Robert R., 223, 338.
Locke, John, model for Carolina, 88.
London Company, 27, 29.
Long Island battle, 229.
Louisiana, American, 338–340, 350, 373, 415.
—— French and Spanish, 133, 135, 139–143, 154, 338.
—— district of, 340, 350.
Loyalists, 217, 263.

Madison, James, 272, 283, 292, 326, 334, 347, 351, 353, 378, 380, 398.
Maine, 19, 31, 35, 36, 74, 75, 104, 188, 271, 385, 386, 420, 421.
Manhattans, 57.
—— wars with, 125.
Manufactures, colonial, restricted, 170, 174.
—— national, developed, 394, 453.
Mariana, 35.
Marion, Francis, 250.
Marquette, 139.
Marshall, John, 331, 341.
Martin, Luther, 287, 289, 291.
Maryland, 43, 44, 77, 108, 129, 157, 225, 255, 280, 415.
Mason, John, 35, 36.
Massachusetts, 37–39, 75, 99, 102–105, 108, 114, 129, 157, 166, 173, 194, 200, 202, 206, 210, 212, 225, 270, 275, 278, 279, 293, 368–371, 376, 386, 421.
Mather, Cotton, 96, 164, 165.
Mather, Increase, 96, 119.
Mayhew, Jonathan, 177, 187.
Mayhew, Thomas, 113, 114.
McDonough, Captain, 363.
Mecklenburg county, 210.
Melendez de Avilez, 14, 17.
Methodist Episcopal church, 279.
Mexico, relations with, 409, 425, 427–429.
Miantonimoh, 116, 117.
Michigan, 139, 337, 341, 358, 360, 415, 425.
Milan decree, 345.
Military rule over the colonies, 175, 176, 183.
Militia, in the revolution, 206, 215, 231.
—— in the war with Great Britain, 357, 367, 371.
Minnesota, 446.
Minors, enlistments of, 367, 372.
Minuit, Peter, 50, 52, 55.
Missions, French, 19, 20, 120, 138, 139, 142.
—— English, 113–115, 123.
—— Moravian, 122, 124, 311.
—— Spanish, 14, 131, 132.
Mississippi, 141, 337, 382, 415, 416.
—— territory, 337, 350, 382.
—— navigation of, 258, 276, 313.
Missouri, 142, 154, 340, 350, 382, 387.
—— compromise, 385, 386.
M'Leod, Alexander, 420.
Mobilians, 56, 58.
Mohawks, 57, 120, 125.
Mohegans, 57, 116, 117.
Molino del Rey battle, 439.
Monmouth battle, 242.
Monroe, James, 322, 338, 343, 355, 380, 381, 386, 388–390.
—— doctrine, 389–391.
Monterey taken, 433.
Moravians, 83, 122, 124, 311.
Mormons, 448, 463.
Morris, Robert, 273.
Morton, Thomas, 42.
Mother country, relations with colonies, 102, 169, 183.
Moultrie, Colonel, 228, 247.

Narragansetts, 57, 116.
—— war with, 117, 118.
Natchez Indians, 58.
—— war with, 144.
National University, 456.
Navigation acts, 105.
Navy of the revolution, 215, 216, 237, 248, 249.
—— of the war with France, 332.
—— of the war with Tripoli, 338.
—— of the war with Great Britain, 357, 359, 363–365, 374.

Navy of the war with Algiers, 377.
—— of the war with Mexico, 436–438.
Neutrality proclaimed by Washington, 315, 322.
Neutrals, 317, 319, 323, 342, 353, 375.
New Albion, 23, 45.
—— Amstel, 128.
—— Amsterdam, 50; first city in the United States, 127.
—— Connecticut, 272.
—— England, 31, 76, 99, 107.
—— France, 17, 136–138, 140.
—— Hampshire, 36, 75, 104, 210, 225, 270, 272, 278.
—— Hampshire grants, 76, 271, 272.
—— Jersey, 80, 108–110, 172, 225, 230, 254, 255, 281.
—— Mexico, 15, 435, 442, 446–451.
—— Netherland, 48, 125, 127, 130.
—— Orleans, 143, 154, 338, 372, 373.
—— Orleans battles, 372, 373.
—— Somersetshire, 36, 74.
—— Sweden, 55, 127, 128.
—— York, colony and state, 79, 107–111, 130, 139, 167, 172, 176, 196, 225, 255, 256, 272, 274, 279, 292, 420.
—— York city, 50, 229, 292, 412.
Newburg Addresses, 264.
Newport, 230, 243, 248.
Newspapers, 159, 160.
Non-importation and non-intercourse, 191, 318, 332, 347, 368.
North Carolina, 78, 120, 121, 197, 221, 225, 281, 292, 299, 305, 308, 402.
North-eastern boundary, 420, 421.
—— Point battle, 366.
Northern and southern parties, 272, 273, 288, 303, 369, 383–387, 397, 445–447.
North-west Territory, 275, 305.
Norton, Andrews, 461.
Nullification in Kentucky, 333.
—— in Virginia, 333, 395.
—— in Massachusetts, 371, 372, 376, 377.
—— in Connecticut, 371.
—— in Georgia, 393, 395.
—— in South Carolina, 395, 399–403.

Occupations, 156, 453.
Oglethorpe, James Edward, 82, 83, 133, 134.
Ohio, 142, 275, 341, 358, 360.
—— Company, 151.
Opechancanough, 115.
Orders in council, British, against American commerce, 317, 345, 347, 353.
Oregon, 432, 446.
—— controversy, 431, 432.
Orleans, Territory of, 340.
Osceola, 410.
Otis, James, 177, 186, 188.
Ottawas, 57.
—— war with, 122.

Paine, Thomas, 294.
Palo Alto battle, 433.
Panama, congress of, 391.
Papal bull in favor of Spain, 10.
Paper money, 232.
Parliament, authority of, 104–106, 174, 186. (See *Acts.*)
Parties, in the colonies, 184, 191, 196, 217, 222, 226.
—— in the United States, 226, 273, 285, 286, 288, 291, 299, 302, 303, 307, 308, 314, 316, 320, 321, 323, 324, 330, 333, 335, 339, 355, 368, 369, 383–387, 411, 445.
Patroons, 50.
Payne, John H., 461.
Penn, William, 81, 101, 167.
Pennsylvania, 81, 101, 109, 122, 142 157, 166, 225, 277, 278, 281, 292, 308, 415, 416.
—— insurrection, 308, 309.
Pequots, 57.
—— war with, 116.
Percival, James G., 461.
Perry, Lieutenant Oliver H., 359.
Persecution in Massachusetts, 43, 91–95, 98.
—— in other colonies, 96, 97.
—— in New Netherland, 127.
Pessacus, 117.
Philadelphia, 81, 101, 167, 198, 235, 241.
Philip, King, 117.
—— war with, 117–119.
Phips, Sir William, 95, 146.
Pickering, John, 459.
Pinckney, Charles C., 283, 289, 323, 331.
Plymouth, 32–34, 74, 100, 104, 113, 117, 119, 146.
Plymouth Company, 31.
Pokanokets, 57.
—— war with, 117–119.

Polk, James K., 427, 431, 432, 441, 444, 445.
Ponce de Leon, 13.
Pontiac, 122.
Population, 184, 298, 357, 452.
Powhatans, 57, 112.
—— war with, 115.
Presbyterians, 91, 279.
Presidents of Congress, 468.
Press, the, 158–160, 457.
Prisoners of war, 262, 376.
Proprietary governments, 43, 88, 89.
Protective system, 394, 397, 403, 404, 445.
Protestant Episcopal church, 279, 298, 463.
Providence, 41, 76.
Pulaski, Count, 246, 247.
Puritans in Holland, 32, 49.

Quakers, 80, 81, 91, 94, 97, 127, 164, 166.
Queenstown battle, 360.
Quincy, Josiah, Jr, 194, 197.
Quintuple treaty, 421.

Railways, 455.
Raleigh, Sir Walter, 24.
Randolph, Edmund, 283, 290, 296, 299, 307, 320.
Rasles, Sebastian, 120.
Reed, Esther, 253.
Reed, Henry, 460.
Reformation, 61–63.
Regulators, 197.
Removals from office by Jackson, 395.
Republican party, 303, 314, 380.
Repudiation, 415, 416.
Resaca de la Palma battle, 433.
Revolution of 1688, 71, 108.
Revolution, war of. — Three Periods, 227, 243: First, 206–219; Second, 227–242; Third, 243–266.
Rhode Island, 41, 76, 97, 100, 104, 108, 198, 202, 210, 225, 256, 278, 293, 299, 369.
Rhode Island, sedition and war in, 422–425.
Right of search. (See *Impressments.*)
—— of visit, 421.
Robinson, John, 113.
Rochambeau, Count de, 252, 259–261.
Roman Catholics, 96, 164, 278, 279, 298, 463.
Royal African Company, 170.
—— provinces, 30, 89.
Rutledge, John, 203, 246, 289.

Sackett's Harbor, defence of, 360, 362.
Saltonstall, Sir Richard, 93.
Saratoga battles, 234.
Saussaye, De, 19.
Savannah, 83, 246, 247, 261.
Schools, 157, 158, 455.
Schuyler, General Philip, 234.
Science in the colonies, 161, 162.
—— in the United States, 460.
Scott, General Winfield, 362, 410, 437–440.
Secession of South Carolina, 395.
Sedition act, 333.
Settlements, Spanish, 13–16, 132, 135.
—— French, 17–21, 138–143.
—— English, 22–46, 74–83.
—— Dutch, 47–53, 129.
—— Swedish, 54, 55, 127, 128.
Seminoles, 58.
—— wars with, 380, 410.
Shawanoes, 57.
—— wars with, 121, 122, 349.
Shawomet, 98.
Shays's insurrection, 270.
Slaves, first in America, 10; first in United States territory, 28, 60.
Slavery in colonies, 86, 166.
—— in the United States, 278, 288, 289, 409.
—— in the territories, 274, 275, 304, 305, 337, 383, 384.
—— in District of Columbia, 447, 449–451.
—— in Louisiana, 339, 383.
—— in Missouri, 382–385.
—— in Texas, 419, 425–427, 446, 447.
—— in New Mexico and California, 447, 448.
Slave representation, 288.
Slave trade, 170, 171, 199, 278, 288, 303, 304, 387
Smith, John, 27, 28, 31, 112.
Smithsonian Institution, 456.
Society for propagating the Gospel in New England, 114.
—— for propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 165.
Sons of Liberty, 196.

South America, relations with, 389.
—— Carolina, 78, 120, 121, 157, 167, 225, 250, 395, 399–403.
Spain, mistress of the west, 9.
—— relations with, 275, 313, 336, 339, 350, 380, 381.
Specie payments suspended, 368, 412.
Spoliations, 379, 410, 428.
St. Augustine, first town in United States, 15.
St. Sauveur, 19.
Standish, Miles, 31, 43.
State, subordinate to nation, 392, 404.
Steamboats, 455.
Steuben, Baron de, 258.
Stony Point, taken, 248.
Story, Joseph, 459.
Stuart, Gilbert, 462.
—— Moses, 459.
Stuyvesant, Peter, 127–129.
Sub-treasury, 413, 414.
Sumter, Thomas, 250.
Surplus revenue, 408.
Susquehannas, 57.
—— war with, 115.

Tariffs, 300, 379, 394, 395, 397, 403, 445.
Taxation, parliamentary, 105, 173, 174, 186, 187, 193, 203.
Taxes, national, 332, 368, 380.
Taylor, Zachary, 430, 433, 434, 448, 451.
Tea destroyed, 198, 199.
Tecumseh, 349, 360.
Telegraphs, 455.
Tennessee, 205, 271, 306.
Territories, Jefferson's plan of organizing, 274.
Territory, colonial, 156.
—— national, 444, 452.
—— South of the Ohio, 305, 306.
Texas, 140, 417, 442, 446, 447, 449–451.
—— revolution, 418.
—— annexation, 418, 419, 425–427.
Thacher, Oxenbridge, 177, 187.
Thames, battle of the, 360.
Ticonderoga taken, 211.
—— lost, 234.
Tippecanoe, battle of the, 349.
Tohopeka battle, 367.
Towns, 89.
Treaties of Aix-la-Chapelle, 134, 150, 171.
Treaties of Breda, 130.
—— Ghent, 375, 376.
—— Guadalupe Hidalgo, 441-443.
—— Paris, 134, 154, 179.
—— Paris and Versailles, 263.
—— Ryswick, 147.
—— Seville, 133.
—— Utrecht, 133, 142, 148, 171.
—— Versailles, 263.
—— Washington, 421, 422.
—— with Algiers, 311, 377.
—— with Creeks, 367, 380, 393.
—— with Five Nations, 148, 149.
—— with France, 240, 336, 338, 340, 410.
—— with Great Britain, 263, 276, 319, 343, 375, 421.
—— with Indians, 300, 367, 377, 380, 393.
—— with Mexico, 428, 441–443.
—— with Prussia, 274 (*note*), 312.
—— with Spain, 313, 381.
Transylvania, 216.
Trenton and Princeton battles, 230.
Trumbull, John, 294.
—— John, Jr., 462.
Tucker, Dean, 208.
Tuscaroras, 58.
—— war with, 120.
Tyler, John, 421, 424, 425.

Uncas, 116–118.
Union, colonial — United Colonies of New England, 99, 100, 117, 118.
—— Penn's plan, 167.
—— Coxe's, 167.
—— Franklin's, 167.
—— Halifax's, 168.
United States of America, 224.
Utah, 448.

Valley Forge, 239.
Van Buren, Martin, 406, 412.
Van der Donck, Adrian, 126, 127.
Van Murray, William, 334.
Vera Cruz taken, 437.
Vermont, 76, 271, 272, 306.
Vespucci, Amerigo, 11.
Virginia, 26, 28–31, 77, 195, 198, 202, 221, 225, 247, 256, 257, 271, 274, 280, 292, 301, 321, 395, 402.
Vizcaino, Sebastiano, 15.
Volunteers of the Mexican war, 430, 431, 433, 440.

Walloon colony, 49.
Ware, William, 461.

Warren, Joseph, 210, 213.
Wars, Dutch, 51, 52, 129, 130.
—— French, 19, 133, 145–155.
—— King William's, 145–147.
—— Queen Anne's, 147, 148.
—— King George's, 149, 150.
—— Final, 150–154.
—— Indian, with English, 106, 115–123, 146–148.
—— with Dutch, 125, 126.
—— with French, 144, 146, 148.
—— with Spanish, 131–135.
—— United States, with Algiers, 377.
—— with Florida, 381.
—— with France, 331, 332.
—— with Great Britain, 350, 351, 353–378.
—— with Indians, 309, 310, 349, 367, 389, 403, 446
—— with Mexico, 427–443.
—— with Tripoli, 338.
Warwick, Earl of, 40, 99.
Washington, before the revolution, 151, 153, 187, 195, 200, 202–204, 210.
—— commander-in-chief, 212–219, 221, 228–233, 235–239, 241–248, 251–253, 255, 258–260, 262–267.
—— after the revolution, 268, 276, 277, 282, 292, 294.
Washington, president, 296–299, 302, 305–310, 315, 316, 318–325.
—— in retirement, 332, 335.
Wayne, General Anthony, 248, 310.
Webster, Daniel, 395, 395, 407, 421, 422, 449, 450, 458.
Wesley, John and Charles, 163.
West Point, 248, 252.
—— Academy, 456.
Whitaker, Alexander, 30.
Whitefield, George, 163.
Wickes, Captain, 237.
Wilde, Richard Henry, 460.
Wilkinson, General, 360, 361.
Williams, Roger, 40, 41, 76, 97, 116.
Wilmot proviso, 441.
Wilson, Alexander, 460.
Winslow, Edward, 104.
Winthrop, John, 37, 92.
—— Jr., 41, 76, 130.
—— Professor, 162.
Wisconsin, 425.
Wool, General, 433, 434.
Woolman, John, 167.
Worth, General, 433, 437, 439.
Writs of assistance, 176.
Wyoming, 245, 271.

Zenger, John Peter, 160.